

Christian Education

Vol. X

APRIL, 1927

No. 7

ROBERT L. KELLY, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

O. D. FOSTER

B. WARREN BROWN

ALFRED WMS. ANTHONY

HERBERT E. EVANS

GARDINER M. DAY

*Published Monthly, Omitting July, August and September, at
Lime and Green Sts., Lancaster, Pa.*

*By The Council of Church Boards of Education in the
United States of America
111 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.*

October, 1926, to June, 1927

Entered as second-class matter March 29, 1926, at the Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 18, 1918. The subscription price is \$1.00 per annum; ten or more subscriptions 75 cents each, 10 cents must be added if payment is made by check. Single copies 20 cents each.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<small>PAGE</small>
Editorial, <i>Robert L. Kelly</i>	389
Who Benefits from a Standardized Trust? <i>A. W. Anthony</i>	391
New Truth and Old, <i>Robert Andrews Millikan</i>	394
Conference of Schools of Religion, <i>O. D. Foster</i>	396
Conference of Church Workers in Universities of the North Central Region	398
Briarcliff Conference of Eastern University Workers	399
Religious Life and Instruction in State Universities and Col- leges, <i>O. D. Foster</i>	400
The Present Status of Schools of Religion, <i>Joseph C. Todd</i>	409
The University Worker's Home, <i>Newton D. Fetter, L. B. Hillis, Charles A. Anderson, Hugh A. Moran, G. Eugene Durham, Merchant S. Bush</i>	418
The New Home of the Christian Association of the Univer- sity of Pennsylvania, <i>Frederick B. Igler</i>	429
Behaviorism and Other Recent Currents in Psychology and Philosophy in Their Influence upon Present-day Stu- dent Thought, <i>Hugh A. Moran</i>	431
Student Thought Expressed Through the Discussion Group, <i>Charles A. Anderson</i>	441
The Iowa School of Religion	448
Adjustment Courses, <i>Edward W. Blakeman</i>	449
No Faith in Prayer, <i>M. K. Gandhi</i>	451
Among the Theological Seminaries, <i>Gardiner M. Day</i>	454
The Worker's Bookshelf	458
Lutheran Students at Madison, Wisconsin	460
Second Conference on Financial and Fiduciary Matters	461
Here and There	463

Christian Education

Vol. X

APRIL, 1927

No. 7

EDITORIAL

What God Hath Joined Together—

Is there a more striking phenomenon in the life of our time than the way in which the leaders of science are paying tribute to the power of religion? If there is a more striking thing it is the way in which great religionists are paying tribute to the power of science. We are discovering that it is only the man lacking wisdom who would put religion and science asunder.

A new prophet and evangelist now comes on the scene: Thomas A. Edison. In a recent article in the *Forum* he asserts that the influence of any one of the four prophets—Christ, Buddha, Confucius, or Mohammed has been far and away greater than that of any material scientist yet produced in the world's history, and he lists Christ first on the ground that His teachings have shown a greater vitality than those of any other. Mr. Edison says: "*I believe Christianity will continue to produce the world's best leadership.*"

In an issue of the *British Weekly*, Sir Oliver Lodge points to the practical unanimity with which design is admitted by biologists who simply cannot resist the cumulative evidence in favor of purpose and plan, and he shows how the revelation of faith and the working of reason are seen to be consistent and mutually sustaining.

Writing as I do within the shadow of the laboratory of Dr. Millikan at Pasadena, I fancy I can hear the crash of the disintegrating atom which is relegating materialism to the limbo of outer darkness and ushering in the era of the electrification of matter with all its dynamic potency.

If the physicists are electrifying matter, some of the theologians are electrifying man. Such a one is Dr. Cairns, the

Principal of Aberdeen University. He points out how science has compelled us to think of the wisdom and power of God in incomparably greater terms than did our fathers. Dr. Cairns shows clearly, as others are doing, that "we must dilate all our thoughts of divine goodness. It must be on the same scale as God's wisdom and power." Shall science surpass religion in proclaiming the spiritual nature of the earth which "is the Lord's and the fullness thereof?"

University Issue

This issue of **CHRISTIAN EDUCATION** is the *University Worker's Number*. We are indebted to the University Secretary, Dr. Foster, and Mr. Herbert E. Evans, Associate Editors, for bringing together here a variety of material of outstanding interest. Data along the same line that could not be included for lack of space will follow in the May number.

THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES BULLETIN

The Association of American Colleges *Bulletin* for 1927 is being more widely read this year than ever before. The February issue contained two striking papers on college costs by President Donald J. Cowling and Mr. Trevor Arnett, beside the Presidential address, annual reports of the Association officers, etc. The April and May issues will continue the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting—the first devoted to "The Promotion of Effective Teaching," the second to "The Relations Between Faculty and Students." Men and women who are interested in the problems of college administration and the best thinking on educational progress and who desire to know how these problems are being solved from within the liberal college should not fail to add the Association *Bulletin* to their reading list. Send annual subscription, \$3.00, to the Association office, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Special rates to faculties and boards sent on inquiry.

WHO BENEFITS FROM A STANDARDIZED TRUST?**ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY**

The Uniform Trust for Public Uses is the only standardized form of trust extensively approved and already in use. The Community Trust is not standardized. Although adopted in upwards of fifty cities, no two trusts are exactly alike. To become acquainted with the Community Trust one must read all of the trust agreements in use in the different communities.

The Uniform Trust for Public Uses, being standardized, will be particularly serviceable for

1. Those who desire approved and well understood forms. This form of trust is the same wherever used and as it becomes more extensively used will be more widely known and carry with it an increasing volume of understanding and approval.
2. Those who desire most stable fiduciaries. This form of trust is not for individuals nor for charitable organizations, but for trust companies and banks having fiduciary powers.
3. Those who wish their property to continue in local business connections, while the income goes to other places. Sometimes the property of a man cannot safely be detached from a going business. A donor may wish to place his mill, or foundry or factory, or other business enterprise, in trust, meaning that the profits arising therefrom shall be used for a charitable purpose in another place. Such a man requires a local trustee near to the business and acquainted with the business.
4. Those who wish to create a memorial at home while benefiting objects in other places. The trustee in the place of residence, will manage funds which bear the donor's or testator's name, or any other name attached to them by the donor or testator, while sending the income to the distant object. Thus at home a permanent memorial can be set up although the object benefited is far away.
5. Those who wish to aid several different beneficiaries through the medium of the same trusteeship. Very frequently a person desires to help a variety of charitable objects—his church, a hospital, a college, an academy, an orphanage or a missionary society.

The one trustee can distribute income as directed among many objects.

6. Those who wish, while living, to dispose of property for distant objects and at the same time do it anonymously. A very large number of benevolent persons hesitate to make considerable gifts while living because of embarrassments arising, sometimes from expectant heirs or distant relatives, sometimes because of urgent appeals from competing charitable objects, sometimes simply because the publicity and notoriety attached to large giving is unpleasant and may bring disagreeable importunity. Under The Uniform Trust for Public Uses any kind of property of any amount, small or large, may be placed in trust without anyone being the wiser save only the trustee and those to whom the trustee distributes income. If the trustor in setting up the trust provides that the income shall accrue to himself during life, then no one need know what he has done.

7. Those who, because of widely distributed business enterprises, desire to make use of varied trustees, in more than one locality, in the places where their different enterprises are located.

8. Those who fear to give to religious organizations lest by so doing their purposes may miscarry because of theological changes which may take place. A few years ago a wealthy man in New York created a foundation for music, using a large fortune which his friends knew had originally been intended for a certain church, but because of theological controversies the rich man had become disturbed and entirely changed his intentions. The pity of it is, the foundation as now existing seems to have failed of its purpose. Had this wealthy man known then of an instrument like The Uniform Trust for Public Uses, he could have easily aided any church organization under provisions which would have followed the changing conditions in religious circles which he could not then understand and greatly feared.

9. Those who have doubts respecting the continuance of present incorporated forms of educational and religious organizations. For example, one large denomination has recently combined sixteen previously existing boards into four consolidated boards. Some men are apprehensive lest ecclesiastical combinations may, in future years, disturb titles and trusts. A trustee under The

Uniform Trust for Public Uses is prepared without variation for all of these changes which may take place in a beneficiary or any beneficiaries.

10. Those who recognize in corporate trusteeships a financial expertness which does not belong to organizations created distinctly for educational, religious or other non-financial purposes.

11. Those who, like a college, have supporters distributed in places throughout the country, and desire in each place where these supporters live a standardized form of trust which their graduates and others may use.

THE MAY ISSUE

Every reader of this number of *CHRISTIAN EDUCATION* will be interested in the all-round discussion of "Religion and American Education" by able spokesmen for the three great religious groups in the United States to appear in the May issue. Rabbi Gerson B. Levi, member of the Commission on Education of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, will speak for the Jews, Dr. James H. Ryan, Executive Secretary of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, for the Catholics, and Professor Albert Parker Fitch, of Carleton College, for the Protestants. Differing at many points, each respects the sincerity and intelligence of the others. None will question the advantage of learning what his colleagues in this field are seeking. Here is a great message on one of the most vital matters in American life and history.

There is little doubt that the normal schools and teachers colleges are the far-away hidden springs of influence and character formation in our national life today. Very little has been done in the way of providing religious nurture and instruction for their students. Mrs. Katharine Condon Foster, of the Baptist Board of Education, daughter of the retiring President of the Department of Superintendence of the N. E. A., writes informingly and impressively on this subject in the May issue.

NEW TRUTH AND OLD*

ROBERT ANDREWS MILLIKAN

DIRECTOR, NORMAN BRIDGE LABORATORY OF PHYSICS, CALIFORNIA
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

One or two illustrations of effort that is not constructive will be illuminating. After the discovery of the law of gravitation all attempts to make new physical or engineering developments, save such as are consistent with and limited by this law, became, of course, ridiculous, since they ignore fundamental and established truth. Precisely similarly with respect to proposed violations of the principle of conservation of energy and the laws of electrodynamics as applied to large scale phenomena. But this ridiculousness does not prevent inventors without background from continually putting forward perpetual motion machines, nor does it prevent ignorant or unscrupulous persons from advertising Abrams electronic reactions, magnetic belts, and the like.

Also such persons undoubtedly have their exact counterparts in the fields of art, finance, education, and all other departments of human activity, persons who are ignorant of fundamental laws that *have been discovered*, who are hypnotized by anything which is new because it is *new*, and who are not interested in first finding what has been found to be *true*; for there are presumably fundamental laws in art as well as in physics, in accordance with which all real progress must be made. One of the foremost painters of the United States told me last week that he considered a very large fraction of what is called modern art to be in the precise category of perpetual motion machines and Abrams electronic reactions—a violation of the fundamental laws of real art, and hence doomed to disappear like all other untrue things. And how many cubists we have in economics, in education, in government, in religion, everybody knows—per-

* Extracts from autographed copy of *Evolution in Science and Religion*, Yale University Press, 1927, presented by the author to Dr. Kelly at Pasadena, Calif., March 2, 1927.

sons who are unwilling to take the time and to make the effort required to find what the known *facts* are before they become the champions of unsupported *opinions*—people who take sides first and look up facts afterward when the tendency to distort the facts to conform to the opinions has become well-nigh irresistible.

The second inference that I wish to draw from my review of the growth of modern physics is that there may be some danger that we may not even yet have learned to avoid the blunder made by the physics of the nineteenth century. This blunder consisted in generalizing farther than the observed facts warranted, in assuming that because no exceptions had been found to the validity of the principles of the conservation of mass, of momentum, etc., therefore no fields would ever be opened in which these laws failed; in a word, *the assumption that our feeble, finite minds understand completely the basis of the physical universe*. This sort of blunder has been made over and over and over again throughout all periods of the world's history and in all domains of thought. It is the essence of dogmatism—assertiveness without knowledge. This is supposed to be the especial prerogative of religion, and there have been many religious dogmatists, but not a few of them, alas, among scientists. Everyone will recognize Mr. Bryan, for example, as a pure dogmatist, but not every scientist will realize that Ernest Haeckel was an even purer one. If there is anything that is calculated to impart an attitude of humility and of reverence in the fact of nature, to keep one receptive of new truth and conscious of the limitations of our finite understanding, is it a bit of familiarity with the growth of modern physics. It is quite as effective as the "tropic forests" which put Charles Darwin into such an attitude of reverence when he wrote, "No man can stand in the tropic forests without feeling that they are temples filled with the various productions of the God of nature, and that there is more in man than the breath of his body."

CONFERENCE OF "SCHOOLS OF RELIGION"

O. D. FOSTER

On January 12 and 13 there assembled in Chicago in connection with the educational week of the Council of Church Boards of Education a number of the Professors and Directors of "Schools of Religion" now being conducted at State Universities and Colleges. Dean G. D. Edwards, of the Bible College of Missouri, had been requested to take the leadership in the conduct of the conference. He, with Dean Joseph C. Todd of the Indiana School of Religion and others, arranged an excellent informal program which was followed during two days of round-table discussion.

This conference resolved itself into a permanent division of the Church Workers' Conference in State and Independent Universities and Colleges. It was felt that this development should for the present at least be kept in closest possible contact with the regular pastoral interests as well as with the Council of Church Boards of Education. So the coming year the Church Workers' Conference will have an "Educational" and a "Pastoral" division. Some of the meetings will be open to all alike while others will be strictly departmental.

This conference was one of exceptional value. Those present came for a specific purpose and they stuck rigidly to the consideration of that purpose. An enriched consciousness of the largeness of the opportunity as well as of the rich fellowship with others reaching out in this field rewarded those who made the financial sacrifice to attend this first meeting of what is destined to be a very significant development in connection with religious work in state institutions.

Almost every phase of interest to this class of "Beginners" was presented and considered, as will appear from the findings which are given below.

We find

- (1) That there is distinct value and inspiration to be found in the exchange of experiences among the members of this conference.
- (2) That the worth of the material presented in this conference and the wealth of material suggested, give sufficient reason for attempting an annual meeting.

(3) That the types of schools with which we are working are four: the Denominational, the Interdenominational, the Associated-denominational, and the Undenominational.

(4) That there are at least five basic essentials in the founding and development of Schools of Religion:

I. That financial and physical permanency be assured.
II. That the organization and conduct of the school be such that the institution with which it is associated be protected from any embarrassment arising from dissatisfied religious groups.

III. That harmonious relationships, in both persons and programs, be maintained with the associated institution.

IV. That academic standards in all cases be kept on a level with those of the associated institutions, and where advisable on a higher level.

V. That where two or more religious bodies are involved, the School establish a program cooperative among those bodies, holding their common confidence.

(5) That it is advisable for any person or group of persons contemplating the establishment of a School of Religion to consult with the leaders of the national religious organizations already in this field.

(6) That the natural constituencies of Schools of Religion at tax-supported institutions are yet uncultivated and that they offer large possibilities of support if wise methods of development are applied.

(7) That the special opportunities of teachers in Schools of Religion are at least three:

I. To present their courses with penetrating energy and enthusiasm.
II. To lead both in the vitalization of the teaching process and the establishing of sympathetic educational relationships between faculty and students.
III. To take advantage of the peculiar quality of their work by fixing a maximum attention rather upon the student than the subject, and by doing personal work with the student.

(8) That Schools of Religion may well become dynamic centers for sending religious and educational spirit into the whole campus.

(9) That Schools of Religion, because of their constituencies, the nature of their materials and their purposes, can well become, among student bodies, sources not only of Christian campus thinking, but of Christian thinking on social, racial and international problems elsewhere.

THE CONFERENCE OF CHURCH WORKERS IN UNIVERSITIES OF THE NORTH CENTRAL REGION

The Conference of Church Workers in Universities of the North Central Region was held at Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, January 3, 4, and 5, 1927. Three score representatives of the various denominations composing the Council of Church Boards of Education were in attendance. There were also present, much to the profit of the conference, the directors of all the Hillel Foundations in State Universities. A number of students were in attendance and took part in the program and discussions.

The program of the conference covered a wide range of subjects; somewhat of a cross section of the field. Considerable emphasis was placed upon the project method of work. Some splendid examples had been worked out and reports on them were submitted. The Rev. Walter Ludwig, University Pastor at Ohio University, reported on a project he had directed with students in industry. This was followed by a conference at Earlham College, where a sort of seminar was conducted to conserve results and to plan for further experiments.

Principles of cooperation were discussed in rather general terms. The advisability of calling a conference in the not distant future to handle this one subject alone became apparent. This subject must be gone into most critically but patiently and sympathetically. A satisfactory constructive policy is needed.

Professor Joseph M. Artman, director Religious Education Association, gave a thought-provoking address, calling out spirited discussion, on the theme "Training for Religious Work with Students." It always does us good to see ourselves as others see us. We wish Professor Artman success in his new position of leadership, and are grateful to him for his contribution to our conferences.

Dr. M. Willard Lampe read a paper on "The Outlook for Denominational Foundations." He sees them as a most useful, if indeed not a necessary, step in evolving a plan that will bring genuine interdenominational cooperation between church groups and thus cultivate "interchurch mindedness." The foundation so conceived has its place in the process toward the wider fellowship in the growth toward unity in the Kingdom of God.

Professor McClusky, of the University of Michigan, led a splendid discussion on "The Project Method in Religious Work Among Church Groups," in which he outlined a technique that proved suggestive and helpful. Professor McClusky is directing a commission of the Continuation Committee of the Evanston Conference on this very significant subject.

As usual the interest in "Schools of Religion" in universities was in evidence. Out of this group is evolving a new movement, a new profession and a new attack on the religious problems of our state institutions of higher learning.

It was felt by many that the next session of the conference could well be devoted to the careful consideration of a very few subjects, perhaps not more than one, and that it might well be conducted on the seminar or commission method.

BRIARCLIFF CONFERENCE OF EASTERN UNIVERSITY WORKERS

The Conference of Church Workers in Universities and Colleges in the United States for the Eastern Region was held at Briarcliff Lodge on January 26 and 27. A large group of student pastors attended. The members enjoyed the hospitality of Briarcliff Lodge and in the findings passed a resolution thanking Mr. C. D. Steele, the manager, for his kindness.

A rather informal program was adopted and the group developed the theme "Service to Students" throughout. Richard Edwards, of Cornell, spoke at three of the sessions on Religious Beliefs of Students, and presented material from the book he has been preparing for the Institute of Social and Religious Research. Two papers given at the Conference are published in this number of *CHRISTIAN EDUCATION*.

The last afternoon three recent college graduates, Messrs. Pat Malin, John Elliott and Cecil Headrick, spoke on the attitude of recent college graduates to present-day religious movements in student circles. These addresses provoked much worth-while discussion.

Reverend Robert Gearhart, of the University of Pennsylvania, was elected President for the next year and Reverend W. Bryant, of Princeton, Vice-President. Reverend Lloyd Foster, of the University of Pennsylvania, was elected Secretary and Treasurer.

RELIGIOUS LIFE AND INSTRUCTION IN STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES*

O. D. FOSTER

That religion is rapidly becoming a thing of the past in our state universities and colleges may now be heard on many lips. This widely accepted, though scientifically untenable assumption, grows out of a well known situation. That age-long standards and conventions are being shaken to their very foundations in these centers of learning is openly acknowledged. That the Bible is being as coolly and dispassionately discussed as Homer or Shakespeare is now conceded. That religion itself is as seriously questioned and as coolly investigated in these centers of learning as the phenomena of the physical world, there is no doubt. Hordes of people are alarmed at this situation. To them religion is dying and civilization is crumbling.

No one acquainted with the situation in the American state universities can deny that there is much truth in those disconcerting affirmations. All know that in these centers generally accepted religious beliefs and moral standards are not only being questioned but are also being freely discarded, thus leaving, in numerous cases, intellectual and moral integrity to make the voyage over rough, unknown seas without chart or compass. While honest doubt may be wholesome, it is fraught with danger. The average student is not a thinker. He is an imitator. He accepts the "authority of science" and scoffs at the "authority of religion." He does not see the inconsistency of becoming even less scientific in the field of science than the theologian is in theology. He does not know that the "scientist" is frequently as dogmatic as the theologian.

Hope, rather than despair, should attend the advances made in science. The danger in the present situation arises in the fact that the "scientist," more accurately the pseudo-scientist, is frequently so unscientific and dogmatic as to ignore the reality and significance of religious phenomena, on the one hand, and that the "theologian" is frequently so subjective as to ignore the

* Paper read at Chicago Conference, University Workers of the North Central Region, January 4, 1927.

methods and results of science in his interpretation of the universe and religious experience, on the other. Between these extremes, our hundreds of thousands of students are battling to find themselves. Because students so often are with unsympathetic professors most of the time, and because religion is not recognized by the university to be a legitimate field of research—by the very absence of its mention in the catalog—they naturally adopt the same point of view. Unfortunately, the average professor, criticizing religion, is less informed on the advance having been made in the field of religion than the average theological professor is of that in the broad field of general learning. Having memorized a few facts, formed many half-baked ideas and accumulated a wealth of uncertainties in the course of their contact with our system of higher education, students in vast numbers quite haughtily display cynical iconoclasm toward most trustworthy means and agencies of moral and civic betterment. Happily, we have some real prophets in university chairs, unostentatiously but effectively inspiring the students to formulate constructive programs for moral and spiritual culture.

To help meet this national situation, national church Boards of Education have been giving more or less attention in recent years. They have attempted this, though very inadequately, by strengthening local churches and putting into these centers religious workers more or less equipped to serve the students' needs. These workers have been, on the whole, good organizers and pastors and have done splendid pioneering work, but these very men soon feel their utter inadequacy to get at the heart of the problem. More and more, they see the need of supplementing the present system of education with religious instruction. They recognize that their approach does not meet the issue at the vital point and that something must be done to put religion in its rightful place in the entire instructional system if students and professors alike, in great numbers, ever give to religion a real place in their lives. Students generally will not approve what professors disapprove. It is hopeless to expect to find religion cultivated among students where the faculty is irreligious. The stream gets no higher than its source. Professors cannot shirk the responsibility of their influence upon their students for good

or for ill. The professors, in no great numbers, appreciate the real place and value of sane religious interpretation and practice in the life of the human race, whereas religious leaders frequently fail to evaluate properly the methods and findings of true science. University administrators, in the last analysis, are answerable to the public for the character of the faculty members they employ and thus, in no small degree, for the character of the students in their institutions. On the other hand, church authorities are answerable to the university administrations and faculties for providing a leadership worthy of their respect and confidence. Religious workers with less caliber and equipment than the best professors are unequal to the task and subject to ridicule. The university might well put more emphasis upon character when choosing its faculty, while the church could quite as wisely put more emphasis on intellectual tests for its leadership.

The need of religious instruction at these institutions is so generally felt that movements of inconsequential proportions in their behalf receive consideration far beyond their apparent merits. For years these state schools had no program of religious education and activities except what was to be found in the community in detached and unrelated churches of varying strength and fitness. Later, the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations entered the field, enlisting students, coming in the main from Christian homes, in various sorts of voluntary undenominational religious and social activity. Still later, denominations began to build student churches and centers with student pastors (and in a few cases with men of sufficient caliber to be university pastors) in charge. Still more recently, efforts have been put forth, in a few centers, to coordinate all these various Protestant agencies into some sort of Council, Union or Christian Association.

For many years, the Christian Associations and churches sought to inspire the students to study missions and the Bible. These earlier successes have given way largely to rather ineffective "discussion groups." On the whole, these discussions start nowhere and after circuitous meanderings, usually arrive at the same place. Perhaps a small group may assemble three or four or even six times a semester. The religious worker is prone to

feel he has discharged his obligation and rendered a satisfactory service when he can list six or eight such groups annually in his report to headquarters. These pathetically meager gestures at religious education should not be discouraged but strengthened and brought to a basis that will enlist the interest of thoughtful students and the respect of the faculty. When so conducted, they will lead on to something better rather than burn over the field and thus prevent other really worth while growths.

Where church Bible schools or Association discussion groups have met with a reasonable degree of success, their value has been readily recognized. These successes have led to further systematized efforts in the establishment of Bible chairs and schools of religion. These "schools" have been growing in number and strength until now we have about a score of universities in which the efforts range all the way from well organized schools, as at Missouri, on down to conative gestures.

We are on the threshold of a new era for schools of religion. Now, for the first time, the heads of these schools have planned to assemble and organize for the promotion of the cause of schools of religion in state universities and colleges. Much is to be expected of this Association of Schools of Religion just now coming into being. This Association may well do for these schools what the Association of American Colleges has done for the colleges.

Up to a very recent date, the school of religion movement has been wholly Protestant. Now, at certain places, the Catholics offer courses in religion to their students, as at Illinois and Texas, and the Jews to their groups, as at Illinois, Ohio and Wisconsin. These meager beginnings have inspired the national authorities, responsible for the wider service of the church, to get together to consider ways and means of meeting the real issue so keenly felt but so vaguely conceived.

Certain denominations, *e.g.*, the Disciples, eager to do something along this line, have organized Bible chairs. Others, as the Methodists, have established foundations to include Bible instruction, while still others show no active interest as yet in this approach to the university religious problem. These denominational developments have met with varying degrees of success but in all cases *un-* or *inter*-denominationalizing tendencies soon

appear. It is an all but unanimous conviction now that the detached chairs should give way to organized groups of teachers in an organized faculty or school of religion. Such developments have taken place, as at Indiana University and the Universities of Kansas and Missouri. The need of such a development is now to be seen at the Universities of Illinois and Texas particularly. In other centers, one instructor is financed by a group of churches, as at the Universities of Ohio, Montana, North Carolina and Michigan and Iowa State College.

Nothing less than a prophetic development is being witnessed at the University of Iowa, where state, university and church, Catholic, Jewish and Protestant, jointly shoulder responsibilities in the task of bringing religion to the reflective attention of the student body. The plan adopted here provides for the maximum results with the minimum outlay, without the surrender of principle or practice of any group. It safeguards the rights of every church without, at the same time, infringing upon the sacred principle of separation of church and state. It harnesses the faculty of the university consciously to the task of enriching the character, as well as of developing the intellect of the student.

A plan has been approved by the University, Catholic, Jewish and Protestant authorities for a comprehensive religious program at the new branch of the State University of California at Los Angeles. This plan includes most of what is best in the Iowa, Missouri and Pennsylvania plans combined. The plan covers the entire development both of the university and community growing up about the new campus. It is to be guided by a central, directing council composed of officially appointed representatives of the University, Catholic, Jewish and Protestant groups. All policies and plans are to be approved by this central body, working in the fields of finance, activities, formal religious education, worship and building programs.

All the foregoing developments bring the parties responsible for the promotion of religion in these great centers of student life to a new evaluation of their task and to a new challenge for serious effort. The meager beginnings of past years are now being seen to have been far more significant than they have been understood to be. They have been the early steps in the process

upward and are thus not to be despised but respected and encouraged and more accurately evaluated.

Educators are recognizing as never before that our principle of separation of church and state as heretofore understood has, in its divorcing religion from education, in no small degree been educating pagans. The seriousness of the situation grows more and more apparent each passing year. With all the preaching in local churches, pastoral attention and programs of activities, only the periphery of the problem is being touched. Attempts are being made to bind up the mangled at the foot of the mountain rather than to build a railing at the top to prevent the falling. The university itself has not had sufficient consciousness of the value of religion to make it felt in the activities and teaching on the campus to any appreciable degree.

Religious education cannot and should not be made compulsory as a part of the university curriculum but it can be put on as high a plane, considered to be of equal importance for the well being of the world, as mere informational subjects. For religion to be given a real place in public education, many things must be presupposed. It must be recognized to have academic and cultural value of prime importance. It must be understood to be one of the fundamental human needs. It must be thought of as the basic unifying reality underlying the rich varieties of creeds and rituals.

The present chaotic status of organized religion holds the attention of the average professor and student upon differences, which to them, largely for lack of information, are glaring contradictions, inconsistencies and jealousies, rather than upon the rich impulse of oneness in motive for, and fellowship with, the best and noblest aspirations for human and Divine relationships. They see hindrance rather than help for a richer and finer citizenship, coming from religion. This undermining state of affairs is the harvest now being reaped for sectarianism seed sowing.

But it is said, How can this confusion of the Babel of sects be brought to order? This is the educational riddle of the century, the very problem that is worthy of the best brains and the greatest consecration to be found in the nation. But that some modicum of order, some basic appreciation of religious values, must

be realized before a *modus vivendi* can issue in a *modus operandi* cannot be doubted. The scholarship and consecration of church leaders to-day are more wisely dedicated to the search for basic agreements and common interests than in the defense and propagation of differences. In the battle for sect, religion itself has been dwarfed. The army has lost its offensive power by the mutinous struggles between the regimental sects composing it. Our youth, as well as many of their elders, do not see the reason for the contentions and differences and thus lose interest in religion itself. Unfortunately, this apathy for religion frequently turns into antagonism and the very religion which gave to the student his greatest moral incentives, is repudiated. The student world has passed judgment on sectarianism and has condemned it. The same student world is now passing judgment on religion itself and the thoughtful observer stands breathless, waiting for its decision.

The hour has struck for educators, religious leaders and all who have any contribution to make toward saving the situation to dedicate their best toward the solution of this most difficult problem. Happily, Catholic, Jewish, Protestant and university officials are awakening more and more to the seriousness of this crisis. They realize that the cause of the disease must be removed before a cure can be effected. They know the differences in religious interpretation and practices cannot be ignored or materially changed, but they further recognize that in cooperation and mutual confidence and with a better understanding, constructive programs may be inaugurated which will, in time, put religion in its rightful place in the educational process of our public system. The "exactly how" is yet to be determined, but that progress is now being made is certain. These comprehensive, cooperative efforts are striking directly at the seat of the disease. Upon their success hang greater consequences than those nearby have been able to foresee. Only the perspective of time can show how accurately the diagnoses have been made and how faithfully the remedies have been applied. Without some such broad approach, there is little hope. The program must evolve from within the responsible groups—out of the hearts of sympathy—rather than from the unfeeling critics from with-

out. The one will be constructive and build with the best materials of the past, while the other will be iconoclastic and ignore the real abiding treasures of previous experience. The one promises hope, the other despair. In the defense of religion itself and consequently of morals as well, Catholic, Jewish and Protestant leaders, as well as public educators, together must join hands, dedicate their brains and consecrate their hearts. The time is here for these responsible heads to work together. The doctrine of separation of church and state in no way prevents them from meeting their supreme obligation to the hundreds of thousands of youth in the state institutions of higher learning. The public has a right to demand this of university administrators and church leaders. Fortunately, these very leaders are making gestures to meet this challenge.

The universities to-day need great souls in high positions. There are needed in positions of leadership men who feel the sting of moral failure as keenly for one religious group as for another. Incarnations of real religion, rather than champions of creeds, are the need of the hour. Through the highest loyalty to one group, these leaders may better understand and serve all groups. Sympathetic understanding and cooperation between religious groups and with the university authorities will not only avoid destructive competition but find a solution for what has been our most pressing problem in public education in America.

The schools of religion, growing up in American universities, may be thought of as infantile efforts, mostly unconscious, to introduce religion in some way into public education, but, as previously stated, they have been Protestant. Obviously, therefore, these efforts must be supplanted, or at least supplemented, since they represent but a part of America's religious life. A scheme must be found to provide facilities for Catholic, Jewish and Protestant students alike, each to have instruction by a representative of his own faith, on the same academic level as the standard maintained by the university. More is meant in this paper by the term "instruction" in religion than the mere impartation, in a high academic fashion, of the facts of religion.

These developments, to be safe for the interests of both church and state, must always be in close counsel with the highest

authorities of the constituent groups. These authorities should form, cooperatively, a permanent central advising and counselling body, with no power locally except in the appeal of the wisdom of its pronouncements. With close relationships existing between these local schools, developing in various universities, and the central Council, a national program would rapidly evolve with certain generally accepted principles and practices. The close contact between local and national groups would enrich both, create broader understanding, lift standards, provide information and counsel, and help create a new sense of religious and racial solidarity in the universities and nation.

Sufficient progress has been made in the direction just suggested to be an earnest of what may be expected. Religion will be given its rightful place in the university. "The how" is not determined but the process has begun. The program will involve a new leadership, a permanent central association of public educators, Catholic, Jewish and Protestant educational officials, millions of money and training centers of religious life and instruction in our various state universities and colleges.

Religion will ultimately be taught at our state schools, be fostered by the churches and university administrations cooperating in a common responsibility, and cultivated through jointly constructed programs of character building.

HARVARD PRIZE HYMN

I know not how that Bethlehem's Babe
Could in the God-head be;
I only know the Manger Child
Has brought God's life to me.

I know not how that Calvary's cross
A world from sin could free;
I only know its matchless love
Has brought God's love to me.

I know not how that Joseph's tomb
Could solve death's mystery;
I only know a living Christ,
Our immortality.

—*Harry Webb Farrington.*

PRESENT STATUS OF SCHOOLS OF RELIGION

DIRECTOR JOSEPH C. TODD
INDIANA SCHOOL OF RELIGION

There are three factors which enter into the formation and development of schools of religion. They are a theory of education, ecclesiastical tradition in education, and local conditions. In an article on "Religion and the Public Schools," Dr. Kelly in the November, 1926, CHRISTIAN EDUCATION says truly: "The discussion of this question presupposes a theory of the nature of the state, of education, and of religion." So far as religion may be related to general education, we may take one of four positions.

First, we may maintain that all education is the function of the state and that religion as a part of education should be taught by the state in the state schools. The state shall provide both secular and religious courses in all its schools. To give religion a vital place in the curriculum would involve a state favored or supported church with the resultant power of this church over the whole state program of education. With our American principle of the separation of church and state carrying us almost to the practice of the separation of state and religion, it would have few advocates in this country. The nearest approach is in the form of suggestions that there are certain phases and literature of religion that the state could teach effectively without any offense to any of the differing religious groups of our citizenship.

A second theory of relating religion to education is based on the proposal that all education is the function of the church. Religion is an integral part of education, so essential that the only way to give it its rightful place in the schooling of the child is to have the church become responsible for his entire training. Dr. James H. Ryan gave voice to this position to this Council a year ago when he said:

The establishment in the child mind of a set of ideals which do not rise beyond succeeding in this world, which make of morality a matter of individual taste or conviction, or which regard faith in God and in the mission of Our Lord to men as of secondary importance, can but mark the beginning of

the end of a vigorous Christian life. Christianity can only with difficulty be taught to the child in a school whose whole influence is towards the idea that religion is a mere appendix of life or a superfluous accomplishment like the acquisition of a knowledge of music or of painting. If religion is to be made vital in the life of the adult, it must be taught him as a child, not in any kind of context, but in as advantageous a position as is given to every other subject of the school curriculum.

The Catholic educational program is simple. We want every Catholic child in a Catholic school. We are far indeed from realizing such an ideal.

If all religious groups adopted this principle and realized their ideals, it would mean that nearly all education would become the function of religion or the church. If such a practice should prevail the public schools would disappear or be maintained for only such as were unrelated to any religious group. But religion would have just as large a place in the church conducted school as church authorities might deem advisable.

Then, again, we may take the position we are taking generally in the United States. It is that the state shall offer education to all the children of all its citizens. But that the state shall not include in its responsibility education in religion. Religious groups or others who prefer non-state education are permitted to have it provided educational standards are maintained. But religion and all education in religion, all Biblical and religious instruction, so far as the state is concerned is left entirely to the church, the home, or completely disregarded. The state here in America neither undertakes to transmit the religious inheritance to its citizens or organizes its curriculum so as to permit non-state forces to provide it effectively. In this state of affairs the church, the Protestant church particularly, has settled down to the use of the home, church services, church organizations, and the Sunday school as about all it can hope to do in education. In other words neither the state nor the church is providing religion as a part of the educational process for our citizens.

The school of religion movement has developed with the conviction that religion should be an effective part of education, and that with the American principle of church and state kept in-

violate, there is a way by which it can be done. This offers a fourth approach to the problem. Let education remain the function of the state. Let the state offer education to all its children. Let it be agreed that the state shall not provide religion as a part of state education. But let it be thoroughly understood by the state that it provides only a part of education, that religion is also a vital factor in the educational process, second to nothing else. Let the church understand that it too has a very large responsibility in education, and provide a second system of schools alongside, cooperating with, and supplementing general state education. Let the church provide actual schools in which religion shall be taught during the week, taught in well equipped buildings by well trained teachers, taught as many hours as necessary to give religion its proper place in the curriculum. Let the state recognize that these church provided subjects are as much a part of education as that furnished by the state, and so release the children, cooperate with and credit the courses in religion, that the church taught classes shall be as effective and as well recognized as any other classes. This rests on a conviction that any program offered by the church that falls short of making religion a genuine part of the educational experience of the child, will never meet the needs of either education or religion. The satisfied assumption that church services, home influence, Sunday school, or anything else short of actual school work will give religion its rightful and necessary place in education is but to continue our present process of training our citizens to consider religion quite secondary. In fact, it is to admit that religion is not a part of education.

Now, it is this fourth theory of the relations of the state, education and religion that has been a large influence in creating our schools of religion at tax-supported institutions of higher education. It is that the state and the church are responsible for two separate but equally vital fields of education, or parts of education, and that although we may have complete separation of church and state, we may also have complete cooperation in both rendering to children of both a complete instead of a partial education. Out of this conviction has grown the educational emphasis in the religious approach to students at tax-supported schools.

Another factor in the school of religion movement at tax-supported schools has been our ecclesiastical tradition in church college education. We have approached the state universities out of a church college experience. This is illustrated strikingly in the work done at state schools by the Disciples. Their church colleges were not only church colleges as other churches have created and maintained them, but church colleges with their emphasis manifest, church colleges with a Biblical emphasis. Alexander Campbell, the president, writing of his school in 1850, says: "Bethany College is the only college known to us in the civilized world, founded upon the Bible. It is not a theological school, founded upon human theology, nor a school of divinity, founded upon the Bible; but a literary and scientific institution, founded upon the Bible as the basis of all true science and true learning." This attitude influenced the founding and conduct of all their colleges. It was quite natural, therefore, that this educational tradition should affect the Disciples when they approached the state universities and found them entirely free from Biblical instruction. Their Bible chairs adjacent to the state universities carried over into this other educational field the convictions and practices and even terminology of their own colleges. And the same thing could be illustrated from the college thinking and habits of other communions.

Protestantism has very largely given up the support of secondary education, but continues the conviction that the church should remain in the field of education, and that religion is a vital part of it in maintaining church colleges even though the state now offers higher education to all who will receive it. For a justification of their continuance we have the parish school apologies applied to the college field. And when we face the state university our plans are very largely in the direction of making the state school like the church college in provision for religious life and instruction. I must confess personally that my own efforts at tax-supported schools reflect the conviction that the type of education attempted for me at a Presbyterian college was correct and that I would like to see state school students have just what I had in religious atmosphere and instruction. I feel many of my associates in state university work could make the same confession.

What did we have in this Presbyterian college? First of all, we could not escape the fact that the college, the faculty, had a distinct interest in our moral and religious life, in our church relations. Attendance at church and Sunday school was distinctly encouraged, and the example in church leadership was set by the faculty. Active Christian Associations on the campus gave mid-week student expression opportunities. Daily chapel services brought to us frequently the religious leaders of the world. And then, sixteen semester hours of Biblical and religious instruction were required for graduation. Religion was not overdone and made oppressive, but neither was it a side issue or secondary. Religion and religious instruction was an integral part of what the college transmitted to its students. Out of such church college experiences have grown the efforts to create similar conditions at tax-supported schools. That is, just so far as the state relations of the tax-supported schools make it possible. These ecclesiastical traditions in education as preserved in our church colleges constitute an influential factor in the present status of schools of religion.

But also theory and tradition have been forced to conform somewhat to conditions as they appeared locally at tax-supported schools. There are no two schools of religion in America that are alike even though back of them are much the same theories and traditions. Anyone attempting to create a model of an ideal school of religion and go across the nation expecting that it would be accepted at all the university centers would discover varieties of religious experience he never dreamed existed. Previous and present religious efforts on the ground, personnel, yes, and personality also, faculty attitudes, state individualities, local geography, university president attitudes, Christian Associations, student pastors, local pastors, interdenominational relations, Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant relations, etc., etc., all enter into what you can do at any one school irrespective of any well established theories of education and religion and any cherished traditions about an ideal college atmosphere, organization and curriculum.

Withal there seem to emerge some general lines of development in schools of religion.

First then, what shall a school of religion do? How much of the religious life about the campus shall it attempt to provide? Shall it confine itself to Biblical and religious instruction, or even make this its main emphasis, or enter the inspirational field in which are working the local churches, local pastors, student pastors, and Christian Associations? We have both kinds, and gradations all the way in between. However, it seems that in organizations that are more properly schools of religion, emphasis is put on instruction as the major function of the school. This does not imply that religious instruction as a chief purpose relieves the instructional staff of campus and local church religious responsibilities, but that the maintenance of a department of Biblical and religious instruction is distinctly the work of the school of religion. I am aware that there is abroad in the world a rumor that Biblical and religious professors do not have very much real religion, but this is not necessarily a qualification for success. It reminds me of a zealous Salvation Army lassie who started out on the streets of London with a passion to save everyone she met. She stopped a man and asked him, if he was saved. He replied, "Why, my dear girl, I am a theological professor." She anxiously returned, "But you should not let that stand in your way." Although the staff of the school of religion may and should participate actively in the inspirational activities for students on the campus or about local churches, the present status is for the most part that of actual department or schools of instruction in the field of religion. From religious workers actually engaged at the tasks about the campuses whether related to schools of religion now in existence, in process of formation, contemplated, or acting in the capacity of student pastors only, there is almost a universal recognition of the need of the schools of religion that are all the name implies.

So far as the form of organization for offering instruction is concerned we may distinguish four general classifications in the present status of the movement.

First we find the denominational institution. In some instances this may be so manifestly denominational that students from other religious groups would not be attracted. I could name four or five of these, but courtesy impels me to be charit-

able. Other denominational efforts do not express sectarianism, but simply interest in a great field and method of beginning. Such were the Bible Chairs of the Disciples, Wesley College, and two or three others. I know of no informed student of this field who feels that denominational schools of religion have any significant future at tax-supported institutions of higher education.

Another type we might designate as the associated denominational. A number of denominational units associate offering courses. As at the University of Texas, this may take the simple form of an organization of teachers representing several denominations, who hold their classes in their own buildings, but cooperate in avoiding too much duplication and in announcing their courses together in the same published bulletin. Or, as at the University of Illinois, the same bulletin carries the announcements, some of the units use the same building for teaching, in this instance the Wesley Foundation, and others hold their classes elsewhere. At the University of Kansas all the representatives unite in a faculty holding all the classes in the building maintained by the Disciples. In Oklahoma the whole school is directed by the Dean of the School of Education in the University Education Building and the different denominational units furnish teachers. These instances illustrate the effect of local conditions on the form the schools may take.

Another type is what we may call interdenominational. Such a school has been organized at the University of Iowa. Here the interested religious groups of Iowa—Catholic, Jewish and Protestant, have associated with the encouragement and cooperation of the university, into a wholesome interdenominational program of cooperation and a most suggestive plan of cooperation between the university and the religious groups. This is the most ambitious program of interdenominational cooperation that so far has been attempted. It has aroused more than local interest and will be a most valuable experiment in the science of state and church relations. At the University of Missouri we have another form of this type. This institution had a denominational origin of liberal and interdenominational sympathies. It had a good building, endowment, three on the faculty, harmonious credit relations with the university. Other religious groups became

interested in the field. Rather than divide the field into competing and overlapping efforts, the Bible College invited the others to accept places on its faculty with full freedom of action to continue their denominational relations and activities. Representatives of other religious groups were chosen on the board of directors, so that they have interdenominational support, an interdenominational faculty and an interdenominationalized directorate. So far as enrolment and relations with the university is concerned the Bible College of Missouri is the most outstanding example of success in America in school of religion work. The proposed school of religion at the University of Kentucky plans to begin as an interdenominational institution.

A fourth type we may designate as the non-sectarian or non-denominational school of religion. The Michigan School of Religion represents this form. A denominational effort was made here thirty years ago and has accomplished some worthy results. Various church foundations have been created. For a number of years plans were discussed for forming the existing agencies into a cooperating interdenominational school of religion. About three years ago professors of the university, religious leaders of the state, and interested citizens created the Michigan School of Religion as an educational institution seeking the good will and cooperation of all in its work because of its impartial service to the students irrespective of denominational affiliation. It has no ecclesiastical relations, provides its budget from interested individuals, chooses its faculty and directors without regard to denominational affiliation. Its advantage is in the simplicity of its organization and control. Its problem will be to retain the good will and sympathy of religious groups so as to permit university recognition of its work. Its courses have been credited from the beginning.

In a word we may conclude that schools of religion are still in the experimental and formative stages. There seems to be almost universal agreement among experienced religious leaders, university presidents, and faculties that schools of religion in some form are desirable. Credit relations have been worked out in North Dakota, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Illinois, Oklahoma, Texas, Michigan, Ohio, Virginia, Alabama, and Oregon. In other states

credit relations will become available as soon as schools can be created or further developed. There is little discussion of graduate schools of religion which might compete with theological seminaries in the training of ministers and other religious leaders, although this may be a development of the future. The issue immediately before the schools is to provide for the great army of undergraduate students in our tax-supported colleges and universities. It is a growing national consciousness that any kind of an education for cultural, vocational, or professional purposes that fails to transmit to the student the religious thought, experience, and accomplishments of the race is fatally incomplete.

THE DYNAMICS OF FAITH

There is a popular impression that scientific men do not need to use faith because they understand the reasons for things. That is a great mistake. Nobody really "understands" anything. We know the "how" of a few things, the "why" of nothing. The law of gravitation is simply the statement of a fact; it is not an explanation. There is no theory of gravitation.

Are not the ways of God past finding out? Ultimately, yes, but still we can find out a great deal about them. A chemical library gives a good deal of information as to how God handles atoms and molecules; a biological library, about how he constructs animals; a historical library, about what he is doing with men. By studying the past we can see what God has been doing and by faith in his constancy of purpose we may anticipate what he is going to do. We may to some extent interpret God's purposes. This is of the greatest importance, for it is right here that our part comes in. When we find out what God wishes done, then we can only show our faith in him by doing it. That is what religion is, carrying out God's purposes. That is what we are here for.

To have a strong and well founded faith in God we must know him. We must study his self-revelation in nature, in history and best of all in the Bible, and when we have found out a little of his purposes, then we are to make our purposes the same, for it is in vain that a man fights against God. It is only the man who is on the Lord's side that succeeds in anything. Faith is harmony with God, working with him, thinking with him, feeling with him.—EDWIN E. SLOSSON, *Sermons of a Chemist* (1925). Harcourt, Brace & Co.

THE UNIVERSITY WORKER'S HOME

Types of Homes for University Pastors

NEWTON D. FETTER, University Pastor, Boston

In 1915, when I had been a university pastor about three years, a secretary of a Board of Education of one of the denominations asked me this question: "In your opinion, what does a university pastor need more than anything else in order that he may do his work adequately?"

This was my answer: "More than anything else, aside from wife and children, he needs a house in which he may live with his family and to which he may be free to invite at any time and in any reasonable numbers the students to whom he is endeavoring to minister."

Looking over the last fifteen years of my own experience in student religious work I can say emphatically, "The boys and girls to whom I most efficiently ministered in their college days were those who felt free to come to my home and who through my home became my lasting friends."

My Board of Education will understand that I offer them no criticism when I say that for years we felt handicapped in the houses which we rented from time to time, houses neither large enough nor rightly designed for student work.

Mrs. Fetter and I began life and work together in a small, rather old-fashioned two-story house in Ann Arbor; after three years we tried a three-year experiment with a little modern "Ladies' Home Journal" dwelling; moving to Boston, we established ourselves for three years in an apartment, and then concluded the private house proposition with three years in half of a double house.

In spite of the limitations which the house presented we proceeded on the theory (as many another university pastor has done) that the way to a student's inner life is through the home. It is there more than anywhere else that he comes to know you, and you to know him.

No one who has not tried it can appreciate the difficulty of raising a family and at the same time conducting a house where

students are always welcome in a residence which is small and not designed for the purpose. Imagine having forty students for an evening party in a second-floor apartment with a doctor's office below and a vocalist above. Imagine crowding fifty students into the living room of a home in a double house and having to say to them, "Should any humorous situation arise, please muffle the laughter. The kiddies are asleep in the room above and the neighbors, including the landlord, are nervous."

Imagine saying to your wife over a period of years: "I'm sorry, dear, but you'll have to entertain your friends tonight in your bedroom, the living room will be occupied with a discussion group, or a committee meeting, or a private individual conference."

Imagine concluding a social evening in your home without the accustomed "sing" around the piano because little folks must not have their rest interfered with.

Having waited our turn from those who shape the budgets of the denomination and from those who ultimately furnish the capital, we received the good news last spring that a house for the student work in Boston was included in the program of the year.

We had not searched long when we found an old, substantial Cambridge residence for sale which corresponded almost exactly to the plans which we had often drawn in our minds. The Board of Education purchased the house, a house that we are proud to own and live in and work in, with its large "students'" room with fireplace and music room on one side of a broad colonial hall and a family living room and study on the other side. In back is a large dining room with fireplace and a commodious kitchen.

The new house has made a distinct contribution to the family life and to the student work.

The ceilings are high; the walls are thick. Frequently this fall groups of twenty, thirty, thirty-five, have been in for an evening; they have laughed and talked and sung and thoroughly enjoyed themselves and the children have not in a single instance awakened to cry, "I wish they would stop that noise down stairs." On these occasions Mrs. Fetter frequently sits in her living room across the hall and we find that the girls, and the

boys, too, like to slip over there for a few minutes and sit on the divan with her for a quiet conversation.

Students truly enjoy coming to the House at 335 Harvard Street. They take pride in it; they feel more free to use it than they did when our residential quarters were quite limited.

Beside our own family there reside with us Miss Lois Maupin, the secretary for Baptist women students of Greater Boston, and five students, some of whom give service for room and board.

In our home and without any inconvenience to the family, the Baptist students hold their monthly meetings, the Students' Club of the First Baptist Church in Boston conducts its committee meetings, groups congregate for discussion, and individual students drop in to talk things over.

Two young lady students, having serious family problems, have spent several nights with us so that they might advise at length with Miss Maupin and Mrs. Fetter.

Boys from Harvard or Tech, having a free hour, sit about the fireplace with the university pastor to discuss a recent book or to mull over a problem.

By individual students, by small groups and larger groups, the house is being used. And it is through these contacts, made in the home, that the university pastor and his wife and the secretary for women students deepen their friendships among the students that make possible the more intensive and effectual religious work.

For years I have watched carefully the reaction of students to the privileges afforded them by the university pastor's home. I have talked with students who have been guests in the home of other university pastors, I have read many letters from them and I know that there is something about the atmosphere of a home that makes a stronger appeal to the student for clean living and for high ideas and ideals in morality and religion than any other influence which is brought to bear during college days.

*Presbyterian Student Center, Berkeley, California***L. B. HILLIS, Minister to Students**

During the impressive ceremonies which marked the laying of the cornerstone of Westminster House, the new Presbyterian student center in Berkeley, California, one of the speakers was Miss Pauline Hotchkin, whose words give a very concise summary of the impression Westminster House made upon her.

I am very happy to bring you greetings from those of us who as students have known and loved the old Westminster House. As freshmen one of the first invitations we received was to attend a dinner here to meet our gracious host and hostess and other members of our class. From that time on we felt so much at home that although we came many times on invitation we also came repeatedly without invitation. We came for parties and good times, for committee meetings, for a word of friendly advice, for a quiet talk with a friend, or for a more serious conference or talk with the one in leadership here. Some of us spent a restful week-end as house guests here away from the confusion of college boarding houses. And at Christmas time those who could not go to their own homes were made part of a happy family gathering here about a table which seemed to have a limitless capacity for seating one more student.

In these and many other ways Westminster House has been a home for those away from home. And like all true homes it showed its capacity to add yet another activity to its already full schedule when the Westminster School for Training in Christian Social Service was organized a few years ago and its classes held for several hours each day in the building here. Many young people are serving in this state, in other states and in other countries after having received their training here. If Westminster House could speak I am sure it would echo the words of the Apostle Paul, "I am become all things to all men, that I may by all means win some."

That seems to tell the story. Westminster House stands at the campus at the University of California as a symbol of the Christian home for reaching out in every direction as far as possible to include in its family Christ's students.

The Value of a University Minister's Home on the Campus

CHARLES A. ANDERSON, Minister to Students,
University of Pennsylvania

"This is the first time I have been in a home since coming to the University," said a student as he was leaving the Presbyterian manse at the University of Pennsylvania after having been entertained at a Sunday evening supper. The house, which is occupied by the university minister and his family, is only two blocks from the dormitories and is surrounded by fraternity houses. Its strategic location brings the students within its doors at all hours of the day and night. The grateful expression voiced above by a student has been often repeated by boys and girls who have come within the range of the influence of this home. Frequently a student will say, "You don't know how much it means to eat a meal in a home. Restaurant food is terrible. I appreciate this more than I can tell you."

Many students, hundreds of miles from home, find themselves marooned on an extensive university campus in the heart of a big city and need friendships which they cannot easily form. They have come away from home for the first time in their lives, many of them, and the transfer to a metropolitan center is bewildering. Never having learned to establish acquaintanceships, they are at a loss to know how to go about meeting others. The result is that the shy ones retire within their shells and become disappointed with their university course.

The manse on the campus is a haven for lonely students. It is a joy to watch their faces light up when they meet the children and begin playing with them, for a boy will often say, "I have a sister who is just the age of your oldest daughter"; or, "My little niece looks just like your baby."

Some students will wander around the living room, glancing into a magazine or taking up a book or browsing around among the books on the shelves. Occasionally one will say, "I have heard about this book and would like to read it. May I borrow it?" Many a boy has caught sight of a new horizon through the field of the better magazines or of literature as a result of such a visit to the manse. All of them welcome the opportunity for

social fellowship. Without the chance that the manse offers for meeting fellow students and girls of the city, there would be no social life whatever for many of them. Especially is this true of the freshmen, who have a difficult time to find their place in the university during the first half year. Though they may appear shy at first, it is the diffidence of a lack of self-confidence, and once they have made the plunge, they find the experience exhilarating.

It is difficult to estimate the value of bringing students into the atmosphere of a Christian home, but certainly new currents of life are created which carry many of these young people toward a better goal than they had previously visioned. After spending an evening in the manse, one student wrote the following: "May I say just this? I can't think of a finer service than that which you are rendering by creating a wholesome, 'homey' atmosphere in which young people can meet. It means a great deal to be in a home when one spends most of one's time in an institution." The manse is not an institution; it is a home. Every student who enters it realizes that he is coming into a home.

On Friday evenings during the fall and winter, about twenty-five students are invited to a party at the manse and a dozen girls are usually brought in to enliven the occasion. Many students have responded to these personal invitations and they have served as an introduction to the minister and his wife. At other times students come to Sunday evening suppers when opportunity is given for the exchange of opinion and for the cultivation of friendship. Then again, individual students come for breakfast or lunch or dinner, according to the necessities of the occasion. On one occasion a boy and a girl who had often visited the manse and who were obliged to spend the Christmas holidays in Philadelphia because of too great distance from home, asked if they might come to breakfast on Christmas morning and enjoy the Christmas tree with the children. It is interesting to note that since that time both these students have graduated and now have a Christmas tree in their own, newly established home.

At certain periods meetings and informal conferences are held in the manse when visiting speakers are introduced to selected

groups of students, sometimes considering the problems of vocational guidance and at other times presenting the claims of missions or the ministry or presenting some phase of Christian work which is being carried on in some part of the world. The manse guest room is also used by visiting speakers from out of town who at times hold interviews with interested students on particular problems.

Perhaps one of the greatest values of the manse is the opportunity which it provides for meeting personal problems of students. The various social meetings often establish the point of contact which leads to more intimate acquaintanceships. This, in turn, opens the way for intimate friendship and for a chance on the part of the university minister to guide a student in the manifold questions which come to him for settlement. These problems range all the way from securing employment, in order to enable a student to remain in school, to the more intimate and searching questions of religious doubt. Many a student has found the way made easy around the dinner table for a later discussion of his personal questions in the minister's study. It is gratifying to find problems resolving themselves and solutions forthcoming. One of the most encouraging features of this work is to behold the expression of relief on the part of a student's face after he has found the way out of a difficulty and to listen to his expression of gratitude after a problem has been cleared up, whether that problem was a trifle, when viewed from a mature standpoint, or whether it was a serious matter which would have supreme bearing upon the direction of his life. It is a real privilege to have a home in the midst of students where one may introduce them to Jesus Christ.

The usefulness of the Presbyterian manse on the campus has commended itself so favorably to those concerned with the Christian work among students at the University of Pennsylvania that the Methodists, Baptists and Lutherans have also secured homes for their university ministers in which similar work is being carried on. Such a manse is a great asset to student work and its value is inestimable.

A Home or an Institution

HUGH A. MORAN, Minister to Students, Cornell University

Should the residence of the university pastor be a home or an institution? I well remember being with that very wise and thoughtful man, Dr. Richard C. Hughes, then secretary of one of the church Boards of Education, when a member of his denomination informed him that he had received \$200,000.00 for a denominational building at a state university. The poor man, expecting to be complimented, was almost stunned by Dr. Hughes' reply, "What did you do that for?" he said. "If you run a rooming house, you will be classed as a rooming house keeper."

To my way of thinking, a denominational institution at a state or endowed university is not desirable. Whatever institution there is should be common to all the religious interests of the university, or should be a part of the parish house of the local church. We should not build monuments to our divisions at the gates of a great university. Rather should we stand together with one common message and one united purpose.

The ideal university pastor's residence is a home, and as homey and homelike a house as possible. It should have eight or ten rooms, including one guest suite, and a large drawing room. Opening off the drawing room, so that the two can be thrown together, I would have a still larger music room. I would have it equipped with a pipe organ, a grand piano, and a kitchenette with serving room. Back of this music room there should be a broad terrace, opening on a garden or patio. With such a home, the university pastor, and more important, his wife, would be equipped for all needs—receptions, musicales, Sunday evening sings, religious meetings, classes, large and small, garden parties, and all other kinds of parties.

Our home falls far short of the ideal house pictured. But we make it meet as many as possible of the needs described. For example, on Christmas day we had five students in for a home Christmas dinner. That evening we had some seventy-five students, less than half Americans, the rest from a dozen countries, in for an informal musicale and the singing of Christmas carols.

Every Sunday afternoon we are at home for tea. From twenty to fifty people drop in. Of course the students come frequently by ones and twos for some purpose, and not infrequently when I have been out at night with a group of students, we stop at the house for a raid on the pantry and a bit of radio music. In addition we have a room that is especially suited for classes, discussion purposes and occasional club meetings, but it is not a class room. And finally it is our pleasure as well as a part of our work to entertain frequently members of the faculty and the community as well as the students. Anything that smacked of an institution in all this would spoil it, for as the students so often say, "It is so good to have been in a home again."

Methodist University Parsonage at Cornell

G. EUGENE DURHAM, University Pastor

The first two years of my work here we lived in an apartment. Only a small group of students could be handled at one time, and they came only when it was definitely planned. One reason for this was the distance from the university. Now we are in the middle of the second year with our Methodist university parsonage. It is a good-sized house, located four short blocks from the campus gate. The plan of the house lends itself well to entertaining.

Our effort has been to make the parsonage first of all a home, so that students feel they can come to a home and home atmosphere. We urge them to come, which they do often; sometimes individually, sometimes in groups. They enjoy coming to play with the children, to talk over some problem, or merely to lose for a while the college atmosphere. Most students feel at times a longing for home, and we try to meet this need.

Every Monday evening we are "at home" to any or all who wish to come down. This open house night is becoming a recognized institution. Some students come quite regularly; others only occasionally. Some nights we have twenty or more; other times there may be but four or five. There are never two evenings alike. Sometimes we play games; then again we spend the evening in conversation or discussion; usually it is a combination of the two.

The university parsonage is also available for class parties, most of which are held here. Committee meetings may be held also, and the Epworth League cabinet and the Central Board of the Student Church have their monthly business meetings at the parsonage. In the fall a reception to the entering class takes place here, too.

The parties, however, do not play so large a part as the Monday night "at home" and the personal contacts around the dinner table. Quite often two or three students are invited in for Sunday dinner or an evening meal. Often if a student is at the house he is asked to stay for a meal, but usually we invite them specially. We do this to avoid having the same student too often, and to reach a larger number of the boys and girls.

Westminster House, Boston

MERCHANT S. BUSH, Minister to Presbyterian Students

It is a pleasure to tell about "Westminster House," the Presbyterian student center in the Greater Boston area. Mrs. Bush and I minister to all Presbyterian students in the more than fifty universities and colleges in the vicinity. There are over 50,000 students in the area and we have about 2,000 Presbyterians from every state in the Union and fifteen foreign countries. Westminster House is one of the fine old homes in the Back Bay section of Boston and is in the center of this great student population. We are just one block from Kenmore subway station where Beacon Street and Commonwealth Avenue cross. It is on the Charles River Basin and overlooks "Tech," Beacon Hill and the Bunker Hill monument: one of the most historic and beautiful sections in any city in America.

Most of our activities are carried on in the house, which also serves as a residence for the student pastor. It has been furnished and equipped with one aim in view—home-likeness. Its atmosphere is that of culture, refinement and hospitality. Students are permitted to do those "homey" things not provided for in college life.

In order to keep within the limits of the space designated I shall merely enumerate some of the activities and service.

First, there is a student service at 5:00 P. M. every Sunday during the college year. The opening devotional service is by a student with some special music by students. This is usually followed by an address by some outstanding leader in our church and business or professional life. A discussion of the address and questions are permitted the students. No one gets to speak unless he will stand for a discussion following the address. This is followed by the serving of tea and a social hour at which the discussion and fellowship are continued.

The student workers in the churches of Boston have a department under the Boston Federation of Churches and meet here at times for devotions, an early breakfast and to discuss and pray over common problems and work.

Boston has great graduate facilities and we have the alumni meetings of different colleges here.

Students are invited as dinner guests on Sundays and holidays as well as on week days and then around the open fire after dinner there is the best opportunity that we know for real fellowship and a discussion of all kinds of problems that confront young people. We make hundreds of calls on students in their college surroundings but we know of nothing that equals an open fireplace in a Christian home to reach the hearts of young people away from home. As an aid in getting acquainted, we have guest rooms where they may spend the night and where also they may come and bring their parents and other friends. Westminster House is accredited in all colleges so that students may come as they have opportunity. These rooms are especially helpful with foreign students. It gives them insight into real American life to be made welcome in "Our Student Home," as they have designated it.

Mrs. Bush and I have our own suite of rooms and these are open only upon special invitation. This of course happens quite often and yet not so often but that they consider it a great privilege and here burdens are lightened, problems talked and prayed through, new hope and inspiration gained.

These tabulations are a glimpse of the service of Westminster House. It requires tact, devotion and long hours of work. We have no motto, no written rules or regulations. Our aim is lasting friendships and abiding helpfulness.

THE NEW HOME OF THE CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

FREDERICK B. IGLER, Minister to Students

Is it true that money speaks? Well, the freshman class of the University of Pennsylvania, numbering a few more than 1,500, have just held a campaign to express their interest in the new building project of the Christian Association (the United Church at Work on the Campus) of the University of Pennsylvania. Subscriptions were secured from 1,176 members of the class



toward the set goal of \$12,000, and when the additions were all made, the total amount subscribed was over \$17,000. This will be added to the \$52,000 given by the four classes last February and the \$630,000 given by friends of Christian education in the city to make possible a new service building for the Christian Association in the heart of the campus. Was the Master of Men right when He said, "Where your treasure is there will your heart be also"?

Dirt will fly in March, and soon we will hear the thud of the steel worker and see the activity of the various other workmen. In design, the building will be Tudor (Collegiate) Gothic.

The basement floor will have a large room equipped as a study room for commuting students, and four dining rooms of various

sizes leading off of a modern kitchen where the numberless luncheons of committees and denominational groups may be held.

The main floor will have a large men's lounge, separate offices for each of the staff, a small reception room and large lobby with a big open fireplace.

The second floor, in addition to the women's lounge, secretary's and administration offices, will provide an auditorium seating 400, with movable stage and equipment for use as a banquet hall.

The third floor will provide four or five meeting rooms of various dimensions where discussion groups and voluntary classes in various aspects of religion will find ample room. One will find on this floor also a quiet room, the architecture and decoration of which will help in the development of the meditative and prayer life of the students. It is the hope that this room set apart will become the center from which will radiate a spiritual life at once rational, sane and yet compelling in its motivation.

It is the conviction of the Christian Association staff, numbering eleven, and its Board of Directors that this new equipment shall become an aid in helping the large student body in this metropolitan university to find expression for its religious life and to challenge that expression in terms of the life philosophy of Jesus. We conceive our task to be that of supplementing the university in all its departments in the production of character plus education.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS OF THE MIDDLE WEST

The Executive Committee of the Mid-West Branch of the National Association of Biblical Instructors has decided to hold the annual meeting in Swift Hall, the University of Chicago, June 20 and 21, 1927.

BEHAVIORISM AND OTHER RECENT CURRENTS IN
PSYCHOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY IN THEIR
INFLUENCE UPON PRESENT-DAY
STUDENT THOUGHT*

HUGH A. MORAN, Cornell University

In a controversy that raged recently in the Cornell *Daily Sun* regarding a university education and the meaning of life, a member of the university faculty says (December 10, 1926) :

This effort to find out what it is all about is in our time more difficult than ever before. The reason is that the old foundations of assured faith and familiar custom are crumbling under our feet. For four hundred years the world of education and knowledge rested securely on two fundamentals which were rarely questioned. These were Christian philosophy and classical learning. For the better part of a century Christian faith has been going by the board and classical learning into the discard. To replace these we have as yet no foundations, no certainties.

This statement of the case seems to put it pretty strongly, but from the point of view of a large part of the intellectual classes the world over it is not far from representing the actual situation, while the hold of religion on the industrial classes is certainly at a low ebb.

As far as the life and ethical teaching of Christ are concerned, there was never a time when he was more intelligently trusted or widely followed. There are also, indeed, millions on whom the modern intellectual point of view has not as yet dawned. Moreover, in the shifting and confusion of modern scientific thought and theory, many, otherwise completely at variance with the traditional interpretation of Christianity, yet find in Christ a strong personal attraction and inspiration. Yet there are many others who reject Him *in toto*—morally, ethically, and spiritually. The seriousness of the situation to those who hold the religion of Jesus Christ as the most precious possession of the human race is not so much the present numerical strength of the opposition as the fact that they comprise such a large part of the teachers

* Paper given at Conference of Church Workers in Universities, Briarcliff Lodge, January 26, 1927.

of our teachers. With our educational system already so completely secularized, the effect upon the faith and moral life of the next and succeeding generations may be calamitous.

While many sincere followers of Christ are attempting to shut the gates of the Holy City in the face of this modern warfare, intending to subsist upon God's past mercies throughout a long siege, some of us at least must make a sortie into the enemy country. It is important that we should not draw the fire of our own people in the back any more than necessary, but rather convince them that we are friends, fighting for a common cause. Meanwhile we must subsist spiritually upon the country through which we go and wrest from our opponents the weapons with which we are to fight.

To drop the metaphor, we are passing through a reformation period more drastic than that led by Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli. In the face of what we know of heredity and environment, of chromosomes and *anti* characteristics, of social inheritance and crowd psychology, of the influence of glands and secretions on conduct, of hidden complexes and inhibitions, of industrialism, vast aggregations of capital and of population, and of social responsibility, it is idle to say that the old individualistic interpretations of sin, society, and salvation must remain immutable. Some of us at least must strike out and attempt to state in terms understood by modern minded men the fundamental religious truths which we hold in common with our more conservative brothers.

Having dealt thus with the usual introductory remarks, let us go directly to the subject. *Les derniers modes*, the latest fashions of Intellectualism in our day, are in the main: Behaviorism, Determinism, Mechanism, Pragmatism, Instrumentalism, Freudianism, Psycho-Physical Parallelism, and the Gestalt Psychology. The groupings are only approximate and in some instances overlap—for no two people think exactly alike, or these days would admit it, if they did. In each case there is a general philosophical position, based upon a (supposedly) scientific hypothesis, and in each case some outstanding man is its protagonist.

And let me say right here, as I expect to repeat later on, that every one of these points of view has an element of truth in it.

Hence each has its value as a method of approach and partial explanation. The real difficulty is that the proponents, having set certain self-imposed limitations, forget the limitations which they have assumed, and then turn around and deny the existence of what they have by hypothesis excluded. For the most part they are men trained in one branch of science, which looms large to them, and give little weight to the other sciences, and none at all to the long history of philosophy and human attainment. The outstanding example of this way of acting is John B. Watson and his *Behaviorism*.

Let Watson himself define behaviorism in his own terms. He lays exclusive claim to having originated it in 1913 (*Behaviorism*, People's Institute, New York, 1925—pp. 3-11):

Behaviorism is a natural science that takes the whole field of human adjustments as its own. Its closest scientific companion is physiology. It is different from physiology only in the grouping of its problems, not in fundamentals, or central viewpoint. Physiology is interested in the functioning of parts of the animal, for example, the digestive system. Behaviorism, while it is intensely interested in all of the functioning of these parts, is intrinsically interested in what the whole animal will do—(*And again*, p. 107—psychology is a natural science, a definite part of biology).

Thus Watson, the official spokesman of behaviorism, treats man as an animal and nothing but an animal. According to him the human being is a piece of meat. Physiology treats of the meat as such. Behaviorism treats of the meat in action. He objects to psychology as a name, owing to the connotation of the word "psuke." He objects to the former psychological method on account of its quasi-religious implications. He allows of no introspection. Nothing can be known of one's self. We can only know through experimentation on others. Having lost his soul, the behaviorist has now lost consciousness as well. There is nothing in the human makeup to treat, of which the physiologist cannot treat—the only difference is that the behaviorist treats of the activity rather than the mechanics of the human animal.

Let me give these same ideas in Watson's own words:

Behaviorism has not as yet by any means replaced the older psychology—called *introspective psychology*—of James, Wundt, Kulpe, Titchener, Angell, Judd and McDougall.

All schools of psychology except behaviorism claim that consciousness is the subject matter of psychology (p. 3). To show how unscientific is the concept, look for a moment at William James' definition of psychology. "Psychology," says James, "is the description and explanation of states of consciousness as such."

But, Watson continues (p. 3) :

Behaviorism, on the contrary, holds that the subject matter of human psychology is the behavior or activities of the human body. Behaviorism claims that the "consciousness" is neither a definable nor usable concept; that it is merely another word for the "soul" of more ancient times. The old psychology is then dominated by a sort of subtle religious "philosophy." That is to say, if you admit that there is such a thing as consciousness immediately you admit by implication the despised realm of religion.

Watson then proceeds to account for the origin of religion in the craft and greed of medicine men. He proceeds:

Thus even the modern child from the beginning is confronted by the dictates of medicine men—be they the father, the soothsayer of the village, the God or Jehovah. The soul is really a part of the supreme being. This concept has lead to the philosophical platform called "dualism." All psychology except behaviorism is dualistic. That is to say, we have both a mind (soul) and a body. No one has ever touched a soul, or has seen one in a test tube, or has in any way come into relationship with it as he has the other objects of his daily experience.

So much then for the presuppositions and the point of view of John Watson. Because he has never caught a soul in a test tube, he is sure there isn't one. If a test tube is to be his measure of reality, we might ask him if he ever caught an idea, or a thought in a test tube, or goodness, truth or love.

We see about how much chance religion, philosophy, ethics or morals have with Mr. Watson and his test tubes. For most of his experiments are tried on the rat—and he treats humanity on the basis of the rat. Like Demetrius of Ephesus, we medicine men are in grave danger of losing our living, and like him we should set up the cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians."

But it is really no occasion for levity, and setting up an uproar with a lot of noise will not save the day for Christ and the Kingdom of Heaven. It would hardly seem likely on the face of it

that such crude ideas as those quoted from Dr. Watson would find any ready acceptance. Yet this is just what is happening among supposedly intelligent people, large numbers of whom are accepting in general Watson's point of view.

Some years ago, i.e., in 1907 and 1908, I came upon a somewhat similar psychological point of view at the *Ecole de Psychologie* at Paris—in which the entire spiritual life was denied, the Jewish prophets and Christ were attacked, and people who believed in religious experience were called fools and monomaniacs. I took the attitude then that these were the ravings of a few warped minds who would gain no large following, but during the intervening years I have seen like schools of psychology spring up and like ideas spread with astonishing rapidity.

An attitude like that of Dr. Watson is distinctly unscientific. He has made a valuable contribution to knowledge in his experimentation upon rats and young children. From his experiments we learn something of their behavior under given stimuli, and of their limitations and abilities in learning. The trouble is, instead of his scientific findings, or mixed inextricably with them, he gives us a bizarre and insidiously immoral philosophy which is not supported by nor connected with his findings.

A typical example of his extravagant unscientific statement may be found in the following (*Behaviorism*, p. 82), where he says:

Give me a dozen healthy infants, well formed, and my own specified world to bring them up in and I'll guarantee to take any one at random and train him to become any type of specialist I might select,—doctor, lawyer, artist, merchant, chief, and yes, even beggar-man and thief,—regardless of his talents, penchants, tendencies, abilities, vocation, and race of his ancestors.

No one has ever done this, there is much human experience to show that it cannot be done, and yet because it fits into Watson's theory, which completely discredits heredity and instinct, he makes this extravagant claim.

Dr. Watson himself seems to be the victim of a peculiar psychologic make-up,—entirely devoid of the ability to create or carry a visual image,—an ability which is pre-eminently neces-

sary in the higher reaches of philosophy, art, mathematics, and religion. He is what William James would style tough-minded, *par excellence*. He devotes two chapters in his *Behaviorism* to the thesis that all thinking is in words. In a seminar with Dr. Watson I questioned this statement and said that I could recall many colors, scenes, and forms for which there were no words. He challenged me in reply to draw a picture of any scene,—for example, of a house, unless I knew just how many windows there were and where they were located. This only goes to show how far he is from appreciating the problem. He is like a blind man trying to tell us who see that there is no light.

Turning now briefly to some of the other popular groupings for comparison,—we have mechanism and determinism, which differ as the names indicate, chiefly in the aim or method of the person concerned. A determinist is one who believes that all things, situations, responses, are conditioned by a previous set of causes or stimuli. This results in the closed causal nexros. It leaves no room for will, choice, or purpose,—morality and ethics are but shadows. It is predominantly a philosophical position, and one is reminded of the predestination and foreordination of Calvin and Jonathan Edwards.

Mechanism on the other hand deals with the mechanical equipment by which certain results or responses are brought about. It leans therefore more to the scientific and experimental side. It deals like determinism with the S——R bond, but its major emphasis is on the means used rather than on the goal or end. Thorndyke may be classed distinctly as a mechanist. He does not, so far as I know, attack religion directly as Watson does, but his system would practically ignore and obliterate it. There is no ego or personality,—tear down the human house and there is no body home. Thought and actions are controlled by a purely mechanical system of nerve reflexes, operating through the neurones of secondary connections. There are synapses or gaps in the paths of nerve activity. By constant use, the gaps tend to be closed and habits formed. This is the heart of the Thorndyke system. Let me add, that some of even Thorndyke's own students have recently shown that his system is mathematically impossible,—that there are, for example, more positions in which

the eye focuses than there are possible neurones through which to focus.

William James was the outstanding proponent of pragmatism,—the idea that it is true if it works. You are all familiar with his valuable contributions to psychology, philosophy, and religion. Professor John Dewey has taken over the pragmatism of James, but has developed out of it what is known as pragmatic instrumentalism. He, too, has made many additions to knowledge and to educational progress, but he leaves God and religion out of account. In his *Reconstruction in Philosophy*, at one full swoop he wipes all transcendental philosophy and all communion with a divine being off the slate. Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, the prophets, Christ, have all deluded the people "with impossible attempts to transcend experience" (p. 25). He would have us give up our dealings with Ultimate and Absolute Reality "in order to attain a more ordered and intelligent happiness." As Thordyke is the outstanding influence in psychology in America today, so Dewey is the prominent figure in philosophy.

Freudianism is somewhat passé today, with its "*libido*"—the one instinct and the only motive of life—sex, which must be liberated,—freed from its inhibitions and complexes, in order to express itself. But Freudianism has a host of partial followers in the psycho-analysts, some of whom have developed a fairly sane and intelligible position. There is no reason why an educated Christian can not accept much of the method and theory of the psycho-analysts, and still maintain his religion. In fact the best part of it had long since been discovered in the Christian idea of conversion. Here is a really fruitful field for religious workers.

To me the most reasonable explanation of life is found in psycho-physical parallelism as described by J. Arthur Thompson in his *System of Animated Nature*.

The best antidote to the pragmatic instrumentalism of Dewey and Kilpatrick is Brightman's *Religious Values* (Abingdon, 1926), followed even more recently by his *Religion in the Making*.

I have read a number of books on psychology of religion by preachers and amateur psychologists, only to be disappointed.

Hul dane's *Mechanism, Life, and Personality* (Dutton, 1923), seems to me to meet the psychologists satisfactorily from the point of view of philosophy, and religion, as does Hadfield's book, *Psychology and Morals* (McBride, 1925). But from a purely psychological standpoint as a constructive and positive position, I should judge that the Gestalt-Psychology of Kohler and Kunt Koffka holds out the greatest promise of providing a satisfactory religious basis. Koffka's monumental work, *The Growth of the Mind* (Harcourt Brace, 1925), has been excellently translated by Dean Ogden, of Cornell. Briefly, the "*gestalt*" is a thought pattern or configuration. One sees imaged in his mind's eye these thought-patterns bringing the aspects of separate things into relationship,—and these relationships are the reality. The theories of the gestaltists are based on extended experiments with apes, and with human children of a commensurate mental development. This part of my paper is already too long, else I would give you quotations from Koffka, but you can find them for yourself in this very readable book. Suffice it to say that their findings bring them into direct collision with the behaviorists and the mechanists, and provide on the other hand a possible basis for religion and personality.

Now briefly as to the influence of behaviorism and the various forms of mechanism on the thinking of present-day students. Technical behaviorism is as yet too little known, so far as my observation goes, and too strongly opposed by other schools of psychologists, to have had any deep effect upon the undergraduate's mind. This is not capable of statistical verification, but I will hazard the statement that the vast majority of American students could not give any even approximate idea of the meaning of the term *behaviorism*.

But as has already been shown in the brief review in this paper,—these schools of psychology and philosophy which oppose the behavioristic are equally deadly in their effect upon religion as is behaviorism itself. Among these I should include the various forms of humanism, pragmatic instrumentalism, determinism and mechanism. They are particularly strong in certain of the graduate schools and schools of education. With our common school system already almost completely secularized, I look for

a widespread blight upon religious thought throughout our normal and high schools as a result of the influences now at work in our graduate schools.

On the other hand, the tide seems to me to have already set strongly toward religion and a spiritual interpretation among the biologists, physicists, chemists, astronomers,—in fact in all the established natural sciences. In psychology, which is as yet in its infancy, and philosophy there are some hopeful signs, not only of dissatisfaction with present theories as inadequate, but also of new interpretations like those of Kohler, Koffka, McDougall, Whitehead, Hadfield, and others. I do not, however, expect to see any general turning of the tide in these fields under a generation of say thirty or forty years.

Returning to our undergraduates, I think I see at Cornell and the few other colleges where I have had opportunity to observe, signs of a growing apathy and indifference towards questions of religion and the spiritual life. The students claim the right to think for themselves but for the most part are averse to doing any real or constructive thinking; they have an easy and shallow optimism, and are all too ready to borrow their ideas from their neighbors—often from those least able to loan anything worth while. This is particularly true of the under-classmen; for there are many hopeful exceptions among seniors and graduates.

But even among those students who cling to the forms of religion and church attendance I have found more this year than ever before who have no content for the word "God," to whom prayer is kidding yourself along, morals and ethics are purely relative, and human survival of death but a superstition. Most of these students have taken no courses in philosophy, few know anything of psychology. Their present attitude is not connected with any of the listed schools of thought or traceable as a rule to any particular professor,—no professor has had sufficient influence on them for that. It is a sort of home-made humanism, that is in the atmosphere, picked up bit by bit, unconsciously, here and there. Insofar as I have been able to trace it in individual cases, it is (1) due to the inadequacy of training in the home and the Sunday school, and the complete lack of moral and religious instruction in the school; (2) to the rush and turmoil of modern

life, and (3) to the general questioning of everything, material, spiritual, and social, which is the spirit of modern education and which has led to the extreme forms of mechanism and determinism among more mature scholars. For example, a year or so ago, I had a group of twenty-one freshmen who came to me voluntarily in a church Bible class. But when I tried to interest them in St. John's Gospel, they coolly informed me that they were not interested in what anybody thought about anything 2,000 years ago.

We are going through an intellectual revolution. We are traveling so fast that few of us are able to catch up with ourselves. The fact is, the religious leaders have been so busy reconstructing their own thinking, and ironing out their mutual differences, that few have had, in the face of the vast amount and reach of our knowledge, anything adequate to offer to the rising generation. Amidst the confusion of voices, is it any wonder that so many take their own happy-go-lucky way, and drown out their questionings with ceaseless activity? In this transition period, when everything is being overhauled, even the relativity of space and the constitution of matter, are we to wonder that there is an even greater howl against required chapel than against established military drill?

Yet with all this, I remain an incurable optimist. To me the answer is hope, faith, and love, and the greatest of these is love. And along with these, time, even relative time, for us and our successors to digest the new knowledge and for the pendulum to swing back to the things that abide.

The educational work planted by American missionaries in Turkey interrupted by the recent revolution, has "come back." Robert College reports an enrolment of 690 students this year, the largest in the history of the school. Half of the students are young Turks and the remainder are divided among twenty-one nationalities. Four hundred students have enrolled in the Woman's College of Constantinople.

STUDENT THOUGHT EXPRESSED THROUGH THE DISCUSSION GROUP*

CHARLES A. ANDERSON, University of Pennsylvania

From the time of the first barbecue of the ancient cave men or the camp fires of the early Chinese war lords to the dormitory or fraternity house of a modern university, men have indulged in talk. Invite a leader to take charge of a "bull" session and you have a discussion group. But the modern discussion group is of mushroom growth. It has come upon us in the night. It's name is legion.

The discussion group is too much with us; late and soon,
Quizzing and chatting we lay waste our powers.

When one asks students about the value of discussion groups, he receives many replies expressive of appreciation. The following opinions have been voiced by students who have attended the recent Milwaukee Conference or a summer student conference or a discussion group on the local campus. New view-points have come to a great many college boys and girls who have sat in on discussions; thought and interest have been stimulated. It has afforded a chance for the more voluble to "air their views." The exchange of ideas has brought a sense of intellectual and moral companionship which is inspiring. Broadened religious views and enlarged vision of duty have also led to a development of an attitude of tolerance. Thinking which has hitherto been hazy and indefinite has become crystallized with an occasional strengthening of convictions.

As you are doubtless aware, all sorts of topics are popular. Some students seem to feel that it is immaterial what topic is discussed so long as there is an attitude of earnestness and sincerity. Many of them, however, prefer a consideration of everyday problems with which they and their fellow-students are confronted on the campus. Quite a number feel that personal problems are of the greatest value to beginners. Among freshmen, this sort of topic is likely to be of greater value than sub-

* A paper given at the Conference of Church Workers in Universities of the East, Briarcliff Manor, N. Y., January 27, 1927.

jects dealing with broader social matters. Many students are interested in the talking over of religious problems, trying to adjust the traditional point of view to conditions as they find them in actual life and to the scientific approach which they find in other realms of knowledge. Industrial, racial, international and sociological questions all have their place for consideration in the minds of students. Interest centers rather in the field of practical religion than in theological controversy.

There is no doubt that students who have had experience with discussion groups feel that they have received much benefit. Such gatherings have undoubtedly supplied a need not furnished in the classroom. Classroom work presents various phases of a subject, but usually leaves untouched the entire question of human relationships and human values. Questions are opened up but there is no opportunity for a consideration of these problems. Therefore, many students welcome the opportunity to get together to discuss questions of mutual interest.

However much certain students may have benefited by discussion groups which they have attended, one nevertheless approaches the subject with a deep sense of the inadequacy of the present system. While many students find help, more are left untouched. At the outset, certain difficulties present themselves which militate against the success of the average discussion group. In his book *Which Way Parnassus*, Percy Marks asserts that only 50 per cent. of the students in our colleges and universities are capable of education; half of these are mediocre. The other 50 per cent. of college students are capable only of training. In this statement he makes the distinction which psychologists recognize, that education is a process of drawing out that which lies dormant in the human brain, whereas training only is possible for those whose brains do not possess the capacity for original thinking. The latter lack the originality needed to solve new problems and therefore must be told by others what to do and how to do it. Doubtless many will agree that Mr. Marks has exaggerated the case, but nevertheless the fact remains that a great many students fall into his second classification.

Discussion groups are designed primarily to stimulate creative thinking. If Mr. Marks is right, these groups are doomed at

the outset to a 50 per cent. failure, for the students who are capable only of training cannot engage in creative thinking. Yet we are face to face with the fact that discussion groups have multiplied tremendously in recent years. Much of their popularity is undoubtedly due to the fact that they have afforded the chance to talk back, instead of merely being talked at without opportunity for reply, which in former years was not possible. But any method which ignores the needs of a large percentage of those in attendance is too haphazard to be scientific. Some students don't like discussions. They want to be told positive things to believe. The same attitude of mind doubtless accounts in some measure for the success of the fundamentalists in the last few years because of their positive assertions. So far we have not yet devised a method to separate the educable from the trainable in our program of discussion groups, hence provision should be made to meet the needs of both types of minds. Many leaders have guided their groups into the deep woods of speculation and have left them without blazing a trail out. The experienced and bright students will work their way out, but the others remain bewildered and lost.

There seems to be a difference of opinion as to just what discussion groups aim to accomplish. Some leaders are satisfied if they merely get people to think. They are content if they have aroused some interest. Others, on the contrary, insist that the group must get somewhere, that it ought to arrive at a definite goal. The former attitude is expressed by a young leader who sent out an invitation to students to attend this group with this encouraging *dictum*: "We don't know where we're going but we will find interesting scenery on the way." Under a leader of attractive personality there is no doubt that the group may have a delightful time, but there is a real question as to how much is accomplished by such procedure. The goal itself seems to have been somewhat lost in the striving after technique. We seem to have fallen subject to an obsession regarding method. We emphasize the fact that the leader is a question asker, not an answerer. Elliott says, "Tell the leaders not to talk at all." Curry insists, "When you find it necessary to introduce data, put it in the form of a question." The result is that we have

been losing sight of our objective in the striving after a form of procedure.

The students criticize discussion groups because "they rarely ever arrive at conclusions" or because "conclusions are impracticable." One reason why many discussions fail to arrive is because of a lack of preparation. Too often this is true of the leader, and almost invariably so regarding the students. Let us imagine a student entering a class in the law school when cases are up for consideration. How intelligently could he answer without having studied the law concerning the case involved? We are all familiar with the process of bluffing in classroom recitation, but ordinarily the successful recitation is based upon previous preparation on the part of the student. Why, then, do we suppose that students can reach satisfactory conclusions in discussion groups without having any background of knowledge upon which to work? An illustration of this occurred at the recent Milwaukee Conference. On the morning following an address by Dr. Phillips in which he referred to the Woman of Samaria and to Nicodemus as illustrations of personality types, the leader in one discussion group suggested those illustrations as an answer to a certain point that came up. Immediately one man said, "Who was Nicodemus?" The question was thrown back upon the group and only one person present recognized him. Sidney Weston, who has written much for the Congregational Board along lines of religious education, says, "No discussion is fruitful without an adequate background of knowledge." Professor Robinson, of Columbia University, once stated, "A good many people suppose themselves to be thinking when they are merely rearranging their prejudices."

Who does not recall the fiasco of Henry Ford's peace ship in the fall of 1915 with its slogan: "Out of the trenches by Christmas!" Mistaken sincerity without knowledge of facts!

In many institutions discussion groups are paraded as a form of religious education. We are eager to establish schools of religion whose courses will be granted credit by the university toward a degree. But are we not in danger of becoming through such superficial discussion groups the laughing stock of faculty and administration?

In our discussion groups we have been prone to analyze and pick subjects to pieces. One of our chief difficulties seems to be the problem of synthesis. We become deft with scalpel and with the microscope but we find it difficult to accomplish constructive work necessary for the nourishment of life. A. N. Whitehead in his recent book, *Religion in the Making*, says, "The Buddah gave his doctrine to enlighten the world; Christ gave His life." Our discussion groups try to rationalize Christianity but do not bring men face to face with Christ. In that stupendous and omniscient treatise on *The Decline of the West*, Oswald Spengler, in referring to the city mind, remarks, "We have forsaken the perspective of the bird for that of the frog." In similar vein Evelyn Underhill not long ago said, "We are drifting into a religion which centers its attention on humanity rather than on Deity; which expresses itself in service rather than in awe." I am inclined to think that these writers have put their fingers on one of our chief difficulties in the conduct of our discussion groups. You are all aware of the *dictum* that no man is able to construct a theology until he has first had a personal experience of God. We seem in our discussion groups to be attempting to develop a system of "virology," building up a series of opinions about man but failing to point out that the root of life or its motivation lies in man's relationship to God.

Undoubtedly the biggest reason for the failure of many discussion groups is due to the weakness of leaders. One man's estimate of the leaders at the Milwaukee Conference credited ten out of fifty-three with being qualified for the task. Anyone who has sat in on group meetings of leaders in summer student conferences of recent years most certainly has been convinced that only a small percentage were qualified to take charge of discussion groups. Men were in charge of groups who evidenced pathetic ignorance of the common facts of the Gospels upon which the discussions were based. In a number of institutions it is customary to make use of prominent seniors to lead freshmen groups. These men are provided with an outline of the material and questions which might be presented. Such a procedure has led to the outcry on the part of some students that

the leader "butts in too much" or "the leader was more concerned about following the outline that he had before him than about guiding the discussion of the group." How can it be otherwise with a man who is skating so close to the margin of his own knowledge? Such a leader through his outline knows only how to take them through Main Street. When the group darts down an alley or a side street, he does not know how to guide them through the slums to the heart of the city. Furthermore, many campus problems are taken up about which these very leaders are uncertain in their own conclusions. It is a case of the blind leading the blind. In our discussion groups we have fallen upon days of tabloid religion. As Dr. Harris Kirk of Baltimore recently said, "We are making use of a cafeteria type of knowledge."

Now Percy Marks asserts that the average college has only one real teacher on its faculty. Of course this is an exaggeration, but nevertheless the fact remains that all of us can easily count on our fingers the members of our college faculty who were real teachers. In a recent meeting of the Psychological Division of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a report was presented which indicated that in many colleges the subject of psychology was being taught by persons who had themselves taken only five semester hours of that subject while they were students. The inherent difficulty with a discussion group is the inherent problem of all education, namely, the paucity of good teachers.

Let us recognize the values which many discussion groups have brought to students. We thank God for the inspiration and vision they have brought. We rejoice in the stimulation of impulses for nobler living. But let us not be lulled into a false security by a blind optimism. Group opinion based upon meager personal experience can never take the place of the incontrovertible facts of history. Let us have sound scholarship. Let us discipline ourselves with research among source materials in order that we may give a balanced interpretation of life.

We can redeem our discussion groups from failure and superficiality. Why not make greater use of the facts of the Bible

as a basis for discussion? Why not introduce our students to the Jesus of history, that they may catch His spirit? Why not lead students to God through contact with Jesus, as He led men to the Heavenly Father? Then we can truly study together the problems which religion can solve. Those who are capable of education will then truly develop. Those who are limited will be trained in Christian living. All of them will have an anchorage in the Gospel itself.

We are not arguing for antiquated methods or outworn concepts. The most approved pedagogical and scientific approaches are possible. The material of the Fourth Gospel may be presented in problem form under the title of "The Building of Personality" based on a study of the world's greatest Personality. Curry's *Jesus and His Cause* makes excellent use of Mark's Gospel. By such a procedure students would possess a universality of experience and a set of principles by which they could not only attack social problems, but also square their own lives.

Let us have consecrated leaders! Men and women whose sound scholarship has been fired by devotion. Leaders who, like Isaiah, have caught the vision of the Lord, and who have responded to His call with the cry, "Here am I, Lord; send me!" Leaders like John the Baptist of whom it may be said: "There was a man sent from God whose name was John. The same came for a witness." Then would our discussion groups lead to changes of character resulting from creative thinking.

The Paradox of Progress

Progress is continuous advance in the direction of a self-renewing and self-governing humanity, whose increase in the knowledge of nature and command of her resources shall be matched with an increased capacity and will to use those resources for the general welfare, an increased prevalence of the taste to use them fittingly and finely, and an increased confidence in the ultimate supremacy of spiritual good over all material goods.—*Elmer Ellsworth Brown.*

THE IOWA SCHOOL OF RELIGION

Here is a state university that has a high conception of its obligation to the commonwealth. The statement is copied from the Annual Catalogue of the State University of Iowa:

The School of Religion was established at the University of Iowa in 1924. Organization of the school is based upon the following fundamental assumptions:

(1) Religion is fundamental in any vital program of character education and hence must be given a proper place in our curriculum of studies.

(2) The sense of responsibility for the development of religion should be shared by both church and state.

(3) A school of religion in a state university should be organized so as to eliminate the possibility of the development of adverse criticism with reference to the use of state funds or on account of sectarian bias.

(4) The School of Religion should fulfill the imperative need, long felt by educators both of church and state, to make possible to the students of the university such instruction and supervision of practice as will make the student a more intelligent layman in church, a more reliable citizen and professional social worker, or a religious leader.

The object of the school may be stated as follows:

1. To provide courses that will help students gain a wholesome view of religion and to create an interest and efficiency in religious activities.

2. To provide graduate courses leading toward advanced degrees for those looking toward positions of highest leadership.

3. To create an expectancy for men and women to choose religious callings as a vocation and to begin their preparation for such work.

4. To serve the people of Iowa in all their religious interests by training religious leaders and teachers.

5. To promote a thoughtful insight into the nature and meaning of religion and to lay a foundation for religious education.

The constitution of the school provides for a governing board, which is constituted in such a way as to insure the cooperative efforts of the religious bodies of the state and of the university in the support and control of the school. This board comprises the trustees of the School of Religion.

Dr. M. Willard Lampe has been chosen director of the school and courses of instruction have been outlined. Courses in the School of Religion will be given by the Department of Religion and by other university departments.

ADJUSTMENT COURSES

EDWARD W. BLAKEMAN

DIRECTOR, WESLEY FOUNDATION, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

That education has become too impersonal is admitted by practically all who are engaged in teaching. In *Scribner's* for November President Little, of Michigan, discussed this loss. Without decrying the situation, President Walter G. Clippinger, of Otterbein College, in a little book entitled "Student Relationships," has made valuable suggestions to the freshman or the teacher of freshmen. Here are some of the key sentences of his initial chapters:

Students are entitled to a good time, but they must first determine what constitutes a genuinely good time. The good time must be related to more serious affairs.

It will require intelligent poise to prevent your throwing overboard all your intellectual concepts formed in your home and community life.

The author then goes on to develop the thesis that the mind is "a crucible" and in it each student "works over the old and the new" until reason rises supreme and reigns in all your conduct and behavior.

After chapters on Purpose, Bodily Conditions, How to Study and Intellectual Problems, he comes to Recitations and calls attention to two kinds of memory: the mechanical and the logical. The former is by "rote" but the latter by association, comparison and logical selection. One wonders if the determinism of current education has not put a premium on the former and discarded the latter entirely. The author recommends "the active mind combined with a logical memory as the type which the students must develop."

Student self-government, already a huge failure in most of the larger universities but successful in the smaller units, comes in for temperate judgment: "As long as young people are immature and inexperienced and the student body changes from year to year by approximately one-third, it will be difficult to stabilize and standardize even so valuable a thing as student government."

"Where it becomes partisan and represents the students as over against the faculty it fails."

The matter of class-room honor, homely virtues such as thrift, industry, simplicity in dress and pleasure, etc., come in for sane treatment. Likewise the author has arranged his text as one to be studied, and has placed after each chapter suggestions for discussion, some good references so that all of the ablest writers and many an authority on this subject can be quickly consulted. A full bibliography is also printed, including magazine articles as well as texts.

His chapter on Higher Relations is woefully brief, perhaps because the author sees form and organization overdone by church people and calm, even certitude often absent. He does write, "the student is never at his best until he comes to a place where he is willing for the time being to shut out of his life material things for the sake of spiritual things." But I should say that his book falls short just there. The student should be the hero, become the statesman, step forth as a champion of social justice, and blaze a new trail across some moral or social or intellectual or spiritual wilderness. He perhaps can be pardoned because he does remark, "any education which falls short of religion and of spirit, and of ideals in its program, is faulty." I wish he had at this point lifted a series of standards, marching signals, visions, or far flung battle cries so that the book would guide us in enlisting the Wesleys, the Pasteurs, the Drummonds, and the Woodrow Wilsons who now, perchance, sit unmoved in vast lecture rooms and athletic bleachers called universities.

Finally he says, "Does it pay to be pure and true and good? Does it pay to surrender one's self to these impulses and the highest of life's ideals? Does it pay to be religious? Let those who have experienced the joy of such a life give answer."

This author is to be praised for his willingness to write on simple matters. He has tried to arrest the attention of parents and teachers at a point where we need to pause, pray and think. He has done a service.

NO FAITH IN PRAYER*

M. K. GANDHI

Here is a letter written by a student to the principal of a national institution asking to be excused from attending its prayer meetings:

I beg to state that I have no belief in prayer, as I do not believe in anything known as God to which I should pray. I never feel any necessity of supposing a God for myself. What do I lose if I do not care for Him and calmly and sincerely work my own schemes?

So far as congregational prayer is concerned, it is of no use. Can such a huge mass of men enter into any mental concentration upon a thing, however trifling it may be? Are the little and ignorant children expected to fix their fickle attention on the subtlest ideas of our great scriptures, God and soul and equality of all men and many other high-sounding phrases? This great performance is required to be done at a particular time at the command of a particular man. Can love for the so-called Lord take its root in the hearts of boys by any such mechanical function? Nothing can be more repugnant to reason than to expect the same behavior from men of every temperament. Therefore prayers should not be a compulsion. Let those pray who have a taste for it and those avoid who dislike it. Anything done without conviction is an immoral and degrading action.

Let us first examine the worth of the last idea. Is it an immoral and degrading act to submit to discipline before one begins to have conviction about its necessity? Is it immoral and degrading to study subjects according to the school syllabus if one has no conviction about their utility? May a boy be excused from studying his vernacular, if he has persuaded himself that it is useless? Is it not truer to say that a school boy has no conviction about the things he has to learn or the discipline he has to go through? His choice is exhausted if he had it, when he elected to belong to an institution. His joining one means that he will willingly submit to its rules and regulations. It is open to him to leave it but he may not choose what or how he will learn.

* From "Young India," contributed by E. W. Blakeman.

It is for teachers to make attractive and intelligible what to the pupils may at first appear repulsive or uninteresting.

It is easy enough to say, "I do not believe in God." For God permits all things to be said of Him with impunity. He looks at our acts. And any breach of His Law carries with it, not its vindictive, but its purifying, compelling, punishment. God's existence cannot be, does not need to be, proved. God is. If He is not felt, so much the worse for us. The absence of feeling is a disease which we shall some day throw off *nolens volens*.

But a boy may not argue. He must out of a sense of discipline attend prayer meetings if the institution to which he belongs requires such attendance. He may respectfully put his doubts before his teachers. He need not believe what does not appeal to him. But if he has respect for his teachers, he will *do* without believing, what he is asked to do, not out of fear, not out of churlishness, but with the knowledge that it is right for him so to do and with the hope that what is dark to him today will some day be made clear to him.

Prayer is not an asking. It is a longing of the soul. It is a daily admission of one's weakness. The tallest among us has a perpetual reminder of his nothingness before death, disease, old age, accidents, etc. We are living in the midst of death. What is the value of "working for our own schemes" when they might be reduced to naught in the twinkling of an eye, or when we may equally swiftly and unawares be taken away from them? But we may fall strong as a rock, if we could truthfully say "We work for God and His schemes." Then all is as clear as daylight. Then nothing perishes. All perishing is then only what seems. Death and destruction have *then*, but *only then* no reality about them. For death or destruction is but a change. An artist destroys his picture for creating a better one. A watch-maker throws away a bad spring to put in a new and useful one.

A congregational prayer is a mighty thing. What we do not often do alone, we do together. Boys do not need conviction. If they merely attend in obedience to the call to prayer without inward resistance, they feel the exaltation. But many do not. They are even mischievous. All the same the unconscious effect

cannot be resisted. Are there not boys who at the commencement of their career were scoffers but who subsequently became mighty believers in the efficacy of congregational prayer? It is a common experience for men who have no robust faith to seek the comfort of congregational prayer. All who flock to churches, temples, or mosques are not scoffers or humbugs. They are honest men and women. For them congregational prayer is like a daily bath, a necessity, of their existence. These places of worship are not a mere idle superstition to be swept away at the first opportunity. They have survived all attacks up to now and are likely to persist to the end of time.

* * * * *

Lives That Count

At the laying of the cornerstone of the Graham Taylor Memorial Hall at Chicago Theological Seminary recently, one hundred and sixty-four of his former students united in presenting to Dr. Taylor a bound volume of their personal expressions of appreciation. Dr. Taylor said in response that he would not reclaim a day or a dollar invested in the work he had done that had been grounded in his faith in the gospel of Jesus and the eternal value of every human being. "Whatever I have taught," he said, "I have taught from the ground up, not from the clouds down." To the faculty of the seminary he said—"What you can't pray out and preach in, you can live out and love in." Not from formal duty and thereafter the more significant was it that Mayor William E. Dever, a Roman Catholic, and Julius Rosenwald, a Jew, stood beside Dr. Taylor and President Davis at the exercises, which marked the thirty-third anniversary of the date when Graham Taylor accepted the chair of Christian Sociology in the Seminary, and by founding the Chicago Commons threw the gospel into the crucible.

* * * * *

The prize of \$1,000 offered by Henry Morgenthau to the graduate of the class of 1925 from Mt. Holyoke College who, during her first year out of college, would do the most to pass on to others the benefits of her education, has been awarded to Miss Ruth Muskrat, a full-blooded Cherokee Indian. Miss Muskrat went from Mt. Holyoke to the post of dean of women at Tahlequah College, Oklahoma, where she has rendered remarkable service to her own people.

AMONG THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

Two Inter-Seminary Conferences

GARDINER M. DAY

February was marked in the seminary world by two successful Inter-Seminary Conferences in New York and Boston.

On Monday, February 7, students of the Union, the Biblical and General Theological Seminaries assembled at the General Theological Seminary for a New York Inter-Seminary Conference on "Belief in God." The conference was based on a questionnaire which had been sent to the delegates in advance.

After a welcome from the Very Reverend Hughell Fosbroke, Dean of the General Theological Seminary, the Reverend Leonard Hodgson started the ball rolling by stating what he believed to be the minimum required for "Belief in God." "This," he said, "was first, a belief that this universe is a unity; second, that it is intelligible, third, that the ultimate reality is good and finally, that it is personal."

Another high point in the conference was when Dr. George Stewart, of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, speaking on "Doctrine and Life," reminded the conference that there must be a relationship between theology and life, and on the other side that there can be no real living without theology. While there were no resolutions passed nor any conclusions articulated the whole spirit of the conference was one of friendliness and frankness and made for a strengthening of the relations between the three New York schools.

The second conference was that of the New England Theological Seminaries which was held at the Boston University School of Theology on February 18 and 19. The conference was attended by over a hundred students of a variety of denominations from twelve different New England theological schools.

The conference was opened by the Reverend Henry Crane, of Malden, who gave his well known talk on the "Paradox of Power." This was followed by an address by Dr. Elwood Worcester, of Emmanuel Church, on "The Minister and the Individual," in which Dr. Worcester showed how the power of God

can be brought to the individual to aid in healing and alleviating various kinds of physical and mental distress. He illustrated his talk with concrete examples—cases of sickness in which the patient had been unable to sleep but to whom Dr. Worcester was able to bring sleep through the help of God; cases of contemplated suicides that he had been able to prevent. This talk held the interest of everybody present and the students would have kept Dr. Worcester answering questions for the rest of the conference had time permitted.

In the evening session Dr. Daniel J. Fleming, of the Union Theological Seminary, spoke on "Acceptable Interrelations between the Church at Home and Abroad," challenging the students to more zealous work for church unity in the ministry. Other talks were given by the Reverend Phillips Elliott and Dr. W. D. Mackenzie, President of the Hartford Theological Foundation. The writer told about the Waterbury Mission and suggested the participation of all the schools in a similar one during the coming year. The climax of the whole conference was reached in the address of Reverend Henry P. Van Dusen, instructor in the Union Theological Seminary, on "Our Opportunities."

The following resolution was adopted at the final session and it was moved that it should be circulated among the seminaries during the next three weeks in order to create discussion and to receive as much backing as possible just as a somewhat similar resolution passed by the Northfield Student Conference the week before is being circulated among the undergraduates of the New England colleges:

Believing that relations between nations should be on the basis of brotherhood we, as students looking forward to Christian work, are convinced:

(1) That our government should recognize the sovereignty of China, including her affairs on a basis of complete equality with other powers.

(2) We believe that the United States should withdraw all armed forces from China which are endangering our long-standing friendly relations with that country.

(3) We think it imperative that hereafter investment of American life and property in China shall be at the investor's risk.

We call upon all students to aggressively join with us to create such public opinion as will make operative the spirit of the above through a definite program of discussion aimed at constructive action.

The following committee was elected to take charge of a possible future mission: Graham Baldwin, of the Yale Divinity School, Chairman; Rev. Phillips Elliott, Student Secretary of the Y. M. C. A., Vice-chairman; Prof. William Barnes, of the Hartford Theological School; Daniel Wilcox, of Williams College; Richard P. Carter, of Dartmouth College; Edward Dixon, of the Boston School of Theology; Rev. Gardiner M. Day, of Trinity Church, Boston, and a few to be added by appointment.

The newly elected officers of the New England Inter-Seminary Association are: Ernest Lilley, of the Hartford Theological Seminary, President; Lewis Davis, of the Boston School of Theology, Vice-president; Malvin Pryor, of the Newton Theological School, Secretary and Treasurer.

The address of Mr. Van Dusen was so clear and challenging that we must give its main points. He said in part:

Mr. Van Dusen's Message

It is a very striking thing that in the student world to-day the old appeal of the social Gospel has lost its hold and in place of it the students are attracted by two very different phases or ways of life. The first is the other-worldly type and the second is the simple life. Wherever one goes one finds the students interested in a man like "Bill" Simpson and his ascetic way of life on the one hand; and in "Sam" Shoemaker and his emphasis upon the simple life of the first century on the other. Both types believe strongly in the present transforming power of the spirit of Christ in the same way as did St. Paul and his colleagues.

I would like to mention three ways of laying hold on the resources of Jesus. The first and most important is that we be honest with ourselves. We must be honest with our people giving them religion that makes them independent rather than dependent and seeing that our own actions live up to our words, and above all in the realm of sex morality there is little doubt but that the morals of many people in this realm will be shaky for the next few years and if a minister is to be of any value he must have solved this problem in his own life so that he can be honest with himself and his people.

The second way in which we can lay hold on the resources of Jesus is by being honest with our churches. We must do everything we can to do away with the divisions in the fold which exist to-day, to realize that the picture Paul paints in the Ephesians of the church being one body in Christ should not be fiction but fact. In the past we have too often said that unity is desirable and divisions are unfortunate, but we must now say

that unity is necessary and divisions are unpardonable. We must as ministers refuse to go into over-churched communities. We must feel upon our shoulders the weight of this sin of division as we never felt it in the past.

In the third place, we must do what we can to lay hold on the resources of Jesus by preventing our thoughts from being dominated too much by the machine-made world and the scientific thought life to which we have become habituated. Nothing stands out more clearly in our present civilization than that our whole mental method is scientific and our whole physical life is so put through a machine that we can scarcely look on the world except in mechanical terms. Results of this can be seen on all sides, notably in the tremendous fever for adventure and excitement and in the extraordinarily large number of suicides among young people. What might be called a new science has been rising in the past generation called psychiatry. It has had much work to do but its work is essentially patchwork. So long as we have our machine-made world there will be an increasing need for psychiatric treatment but, on the other hand, psychiatry can never cure the difficulty at bottom. One way to cure it is to try to see life more clearly and to see it as a whole, to try to look at it as Jesus did, with a dominantly appreciative attitude instead of our overwhelmingly analytical, if not critical, attitude.

And this leads on to my last point and that is that what we need more than anything else to-day is a re-discovery of trust in God. We have in a large measure lost the attitude and experience of trustfulness which has been the mainstay of Christian folk in past generations. The reason for this loss of trust can be seen in the rapidly changing scientific knowledge of the world and in intellectual conditions, but until we regain that attitude of trust or, if you like, the experience of God, the world will continue to see epidemics of suicide, nervous breakdowns, crime waves, and the like. We must re-discover God, not a God that is a distant, impersonal part of nature but a God that is a personal, loving Father of mankind as he was for Jesus. To do this we must seek harder, and be always frank, truthful and courageous, for while the wages of sin may be death, we do better to remind ourselves that the wages of courage is character.

* * * * *

Frank M. McKibben, who has served recently as associate secretary of the Chicago Council of Religious Education, is the newly installed executive secretary of the Baltimore Council of Religious Education.

THE WORKER'S BOOKSHELF

Reality and Worship—Willard L. Sperry. The Macmillan Company, New York. \$1.75.

This is a re-issue of Dean Sperry's book, which covers the deeper sources of public worship, analyses our worship and points to its improvement.—*H. E. E.*

The Church and Missions—Robert E. Speer. George H. Doran. \$1.75.

In a time when the missionary enterprise is being severely criticised and examined, Dr. Speer shows the relation between church and missions, and the aims and purposes of this effort. He calls attention to the new demands on the mission field and gives us, from his experience as Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, an authoritative study of the missionary motive.—*H. E. E.*

The Church at the University; Her Opportunities, Obligations and Methods—William Houston. The Westminster Foundation of Ohio, 1652 Neil Ave., Columbus, Ohio. 116 pages. \$1.00.

The author of this book has been Presbyterian university pastor at Ohio State University for sixteen years. He was one of the first men of any denomination to enter this type of ministry. The book is therefore of value as giving an appraisal of this kind of work on the basis of experience. It is also of great value because it describes in detail many of the methods the author has actually used. Its scope, however, is far wider than this. While referring chiefly to Ohio State University and to Presbyterian activities, it sketches the development of state universities as a whole and discusses their common religious problems. It also abounds in excerpts from the writings of others who have worked in this field and contains the findings of some of the conferences, notably the two so-called "Cleveland Conferences," where important aspects of the work were intensively studied. In short, whether one is looking for a statement of the ideals of this new

and tremendously important ministry, or for practical suggestions as to how it should be carried on, he will find here a very useful handbook. Books in this field are altogether too few. This should help to stimulate others.—*M. W. L.*

The Advancing Church, by Edward Laird Mills. The Methodist Book Concern. 208 pp. Cloth, \$1.00; paper, \$0.50. This is the volume for Mission Study classes this year and it is literature. See what "Hal" Lucecock says about it in his *Advocate* editorial page. The fact that the book "makes" that page is commendation enough. "It not only visualizes the more dramatic and important undertakings of the church in the varied scenes of America in the present day, but it also gives a stirring account of the movement of Methodism across the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific."—*W. F. S.*

Samuel S. Weyer, a consulting engineer, has made an interesting compilation of authoritative statements on science, evolution and the Bible, which will serve to clarify the minds of those who are disturbed over present-day controversies. President Emeritus William Oxley Thompson, of Ohio State University, writes an appreciative introduction. The book is privately printed; for further particulars write 1014 Hartman Building, Columbus, Ohio.—*R. L. K.*

It is a pleasure to call attention to two recent biographies of great Americans replete with illustrative material: *The Life of George Colby Chase*, Houghton, Mifflin Co. \$2.00, second president of Bates College, by his son, George M. Chase, a noble and inspiring story of a man who laid solid foundations for an educational institution of abiding usefulness by faith, courage, ability and hard work; and another—a two-volume book—*John Wanamaker, His Life and His Achievements*, by Herbert Adams Gibbons. Harper & Bros. \$10.00—This book portrays a successful merchant, an able and conscientious public servant, and leader in the counsels of his denomination.—*R. L. K.*

Through Science to God, by Charles H. Tyndall. The Revell Co. \$2.00. A book on science and religion which is a plea for a belief in God from the testimony of nature. Dr. Tyndall is sympathetic with both the scientific and the Christian interpretation.—*R. L. K.*

LUTHERAN STUDENTS AT MADISON, WISCONSIN

Lutheran students from all parts of the United States and Canada, from Finland, Sweden and Germany, and from India, Japan and China, met in Madison, Wisconsin, December 30, 1926, to January 2, 1927. The conference was called by the Lutheran Student Association of America, Clifford Holand, Union Seminary and Columbia University, President.

An interesting definition of the church was prepared and adopted by the students on the basis of an examination of ideas of the church held by many different groups. It was this: The Christian church is composed of all people wherever found, who have been renewed by the Spirit of God through faith in Jesus Christ as Divine Lord and Savior. The Christian church should be a united body. The students at Madison resolved to work first for the uniting of all Lutherans, and while doing so to learn to understand, appreciate and cooperate with all other Christians.

The attitude of the United States towards Orientals was deplored. A resolution was adopted recognizing the equality of students from other lands with American students. Foreign mission boards were urged to give native Christians a place and vote in mission councils and to develop as rapidly as possible autonomous native church organizations.

BIBLE TEACHERS

Mount Holyoke College has a fully equipped Bible Department. This year's senior class has fifteen majors in Bible, first-class in character and ability. Five of these would like very much to have a chance to teach the Bible in some preparatory school. The combination of major and minor subjects which they offer is as follows:

- Bible and Mathematics.
- Bible and Chemistry and Mathematics.
- Bible and History.
- Bible and English.
- Bible and English and Spoken English (very good in Dramatics).

Further information on application to Professor Laura H. Wild, South Hadley, Mass.

SECOND CONFERENCE ON FINANCIAL AND FIDUCIARY MATTERS

WINIFRED WILLARD

The second conference of the Standing Committee on Financial and Fiduciary Matters of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, at Atlantic City, March 22-24, was significant for large attendance, variety of represented interests, keenness of discussion, scope of problems and spirit of comity.

Two other groups, in simultaneous sections, were also in session over the promotional and publicity phases of present-day church religious life and activity.

In no wise a legislative body, the conference was delightfully free from the routine of organization. The two days' discussions and presentations were crystallized into the recommendations submitted by the Findings Committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Frank W. Padelford, at the closing session. An epitome follows:

1. That a national conference of similar sort be held in Nashville, Tennessee, two years hence, and in the interim, a year hence, regional conferences be held in Chicago and elsewhere for the advantages of discussion along special financial and fiduciary lines;
2. That an assistant be found, acceptable to Dr. Alfred Williams Anthony, the present chairman, and the one primarily responsible for the growing interest in these matters of much importance;
3. That three sub-committees be appointed on—
 - A. Legislation, to cooperate with bar associations and other bodies in promoting uniform legislation for annuities, settlement of estates and the administration of permanent funds;
 - B. On Ethics in Investment, to formulate standards for the selection of investment securities;
 - C. On Annuities, to recommend, after sufficient study, a schedule of annuity rates, the form of contracts and kindred items of even importance:

4. That use of the word "bond" be discontinued in the writing of annuities;
5. That annuity contracts be written with the definite policy of maintaining their annuity reserves at the highest standard set by any of the states by law;
6. That direct and absolute donations and bequests to institutions or causes best promote the welfare of that to which such gifts are made, but that where a donor does not wish to make absolute donation, desiring instead to create a trust fund, he should preferably take advantage of those forms made available by The Uniform Trust for Public Uses;
7. That life insurance, as a medium of philanthropy, should have increasing consideration;
8. That institutions which do not have available, as board and finance committee members, men who are skilled in handling investments and trusts, should consider placing their permanent funds in the hands of a bank or trust company as custodian and fiscal agent;
9. That committees be appointed to study the whole subject of pensions and to investigate the problems related to fire insurance;
10. That attention be directed to the danger of creating new organizations to accomplish specific ends and of designation of bequests, gifts and endowments;
11. That campaigns of information be carried on to let attorneys, trust officers, bankers and the public know and understand the nature and range of the service various organizations render to society;
12. That the papers presented at this conference be edited and published.

* * * * *

Life Insurance for Charitable Purposes

Martin L. Davey, a member of Congress, has taken a five-year endowment policy for \$50,000 for the building fund of a Disciples Church in Kent, Ohio, conditioned upon \$100,000 being raised for the same purpose. By this act Mr. Davey gives \$50,000 in five annual payments and insures the gift against failure through his death.

The Equitable Life Assurance Society reports the fact that an insurance policy for \$50,000 has been issued in Philadelphia to benefit the Playground and Recreation Association of America.

The Philadelphia papers recently reported that Mr. Jules Mastbaum carried upon his life \$100,000 of insurance payable to Jewish Charities.

HERE AND THERE

A recent report of Dr. Warren F. Sheldon, Administrative Secretary of the Wesley Foundation Joint Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, sounds an encouraging note in its record of achievements and makes stimulating reading for all those interested or engaged in promoting religious work in state institutions.

He describes four building undertakings representing an aggregate investment of over \$750,000 as having been or about to be completed under the Wesley Foundations. They are located at agricultural college centers—Ames, Iowa; East Lansing, Michigan (an enterprise shared with three other denominations), Corvallis, Oregon, and Manhattan, Kansas. A fifth outstanding property item representing a value of at least \$250,000 is involved in the transfer of Asbury Church, Philadelphia, by the unanimous action of its trustees, to the Wesley Foundation of that city. An additional \$30,000 was spent for renovation and the re-arrangement of buildings. Some necessary repairs and improvements were made during the year upon the church at Orono, Maine. The needs of the thousand Methodist students at the University of Minnesota makes an extensive building program imperative, and ground for the project is now held by the corporation.

Financial campaigns as yet uncompleted have been in progress in California, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana and Washington. Of these Washington leads having secured sufficient pledges for a new university church in Seattle. The Wesley Foundation at the University of Illinois is seeking \$750,000 to make possible among other items the erection of a new church unit. The response of the students in Urbana far outran the expectations of the managers. A mammoth thermometer was made to register a

possible total of \$30,000, but the figure passed \$35,000 and the end is not yet. Dr. James C. Baker under whose capable leadership the work at Urbana is going forward wrote under date of September 23, 1926, as follows:

The University of Illinois has the largest enrollment in its history. Ten thousand three hundred and fifty-nine on the campus this morning, of whom 2,800 are Methodists. The Freshmen registered early. Sunday, September 19, Trinity—the Church of the Wesley Foundation—overflowed with Freshmen. The upper classes are now here. There is no room in the church for them. Do we honestly believe public worship makes a difference for our sons and daughters?

* * * * *

The Chicago Theological Seminary reports new buildings now under construction including an assembly hall, a library, and a cloister connecting the chapel, library and tower. The cloister will be unique in having a stone from the Isle of Shoals in New Hampshire; a stone from Scrooby Manor Wall; a brick from the barn of William Bradford; a stone from Wartburg Castle in Germany; one from Solomon's Quarries in Palestine; and probably the most interesting of all, a cornerstone two feet long and one and a half feet high taken from an early Christian chapel near Hebron, Palestine and bearing an original inscription in Greek. It is expected that these buildings will be completed and equipped in time for dedication at the Triennial Convention in June, 1928, which will also mark the seventy-third anniversary of the Seminary.

* * * * *

February 13 was observed as "Recruiting Sunday" for the Chicago Seminary by a large number of Congregational churches. It is estimated that some ten thousand people were reached in this way. The special feature in this observance was the exchange of pulpits by a number of leading ministers who presented "The Call of the Christian Ministry" to young and old alike throughout the field.

* * * * *

Dr. John H. Finley in his new book, *An Outline of Christianity*, declares that "the one soul among all the souls of men who was most aware of God gave to the world the Christian religion."

Mr. P. W. Wilson, the well known book reviewer of the *New York Times*, doubts whether Dr. Fosdick's distinction between the religion of Jesus and the religion about Jesus takes into account the fact that Ignatius Loyola received the sacrament in a little crypt in Montmartre, W. E. Gladstone before he faced the Parliament with his heroic effort to obtain justice for Ireland, and Edith Cavell before she was shot in Brussels. He asks the question, "Is it not a little impertinent for any of us to say that at such moments these fellow beings attain only to a religion about Jesus?"

* * * * *

In the chapter on the "Dangers of Modernism," in his book entitled *Adventurous Religion*, Dr. Fosdick himself says: "Our chief enemy is not 'acrid literalism.' That cannot last. The stars in their courses fight against that Sisera. Our chief enemy is 'arid liberalism.' "

* * * * *

There are to-day five universities in the United States with personnel laboratories and equipment sufficient for the complete training of aeronautical engineers in both undergraduate and graduate work. During the past year these five institutions had ninety-six students under instruction in regular aeronautical engineering curricula. A total of twenty-three institutions are giving some attention to aeronautical subjects, but the larger number of these have no particular equipment or staff to give serious attention to higher education of this type.

* * * * *

The tenth annual convocation of the School of Religion, Howard University, Washington, D. C., was held at the University, November 9-11, 1926. An interesting feature were Round Table discussions conducted by Dr. Warren H. Wilson, Director of Town and Country Department of the Presbyterian Church, on "The Five Paths to the Church" (three sessions), and by Dr. A. B. Jackson on "The Church and the Health of the Community."

PHILANTHROPIC FINANCE

—THE HANCHER ORGANIZATION—

740 Rush Street, Suite 505-7-9, Chicago, Illinois

Serving the Kingdom through financing the institutions
of the Church

In 16 years it has procured 163 funds totaling more than \$84,-
000,000 for colleges, universities, hospitals and churches.
It achieves through Publicity, Organization and Prayer.

HARTFORD Theological Seminary School of Religious Education Kennedy School of Missions

W. DOUGLAS MACKENZIE, President

The Foundation is an interdenominational university of religion. Three
separate schools on one campus: the Theological Seminary training for
the ministry; the School of Missions for the foreign field; the School of
Religious Education for the lay worker and teacher and for social service.

Courses in all schools are open to all students, giving ample opportunity
for well-rounded training in the whole field of Christian work.

Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Conn.

The Westminster Teachers' Bureau

Secures suitable teachers, officers and helpers for educational institutions—private,
public and denominational—and assists trained, capable teachers and other workers
to larger fields of service. The Bureau is in no sense a commercial organization.
Service free to institutions and at three-fifths of usual charge to teachers.

HENRY H. SWEETS, Manager,

410 Urban Building, Louisville, Ky.